

103
**H.R. 3130, THE IMPROVING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS
ACT OF 1993: THE IMPLICATIONS FOR URBAN
DISTRICTS**

Y 4.G 74/7: AM 3/10

H.R. 3130, The Improving America's Schools Act of
1993: The Implications for Urban Districts, October

HEARING

BEFORE THE

**HUMAN RESOURCES AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL
RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE**

OF THE

**COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

OCTOBER 19, 1993

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations

**GOVERNMENT
BPL
DEPOSITORY
8/98**

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1998

49-424

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-057165-0

5
**H.R. 3130, THE IMPROVING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS
ACT OF 1993: THE IMPLICATIONS FOR URBAN
DISTRICTS**

Y 4.G 74/7: AM 3/10

H.R. 3130, The Improving America's Schools Act of
1993: The Implications for Urban Districts, October

HEARING

BEFORE THE

**HUMAN RESOURCES AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL
RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE**

OF THE

**COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**


ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

OCTOBER 19, 1993

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations

**GOVERNMENT
BPL
DEPOSITORY
8/98**



**U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1998**

49-424

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-057165-0

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JOHN CONYERS, Jr., Michigan, *Chairman*

CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
GLENN ENGLISH, Oklahoma
HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
MIKE SYNAR, Oklahoma
STEPHEN L. NEAL, North Carolina
TOM LANTOS, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr., South Carolina
GARY A. CONDIT, California
COLLIN C. PETERSON, Minnesota
KAREN L. THURMAN, Florida
BOBBY L. RUSH, Illinois
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
THOMAS M. BARRETT, Wisconsin
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
FLOYD H. FLAKE, New York
JAMES A. HAYES, Louisiana
CRAIG A. WASHINGTON, Texas
BARBARA-ROSE COLLINS, Michigan
CORRINE BROWN, Florida
MARJORIE MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY,
 Pennsylvania
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
GENE GREEN, Texas
BART STUPAK, Michigan

WILLIAM F. CLINGER, Jr., Pennsylvania
AL McCANDLESS, California
J. DENNIS HASTERT, Illinois
JON L. KYL, Arizona
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut
STEVEN SCHIFF, New Mexico
CHRISTOPHER COX, California
CRAIG THOMAS, Wyoming
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
DICK ZIMMER, New Jersey
WILLIAM H. ZELIFF, Jr., New Hampshire
JOHN M. McHUGH, New York
STEPHEN HORN, California
DEBORAH PRYCE, Ohio
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
ROB PORTMAN, Ohio

BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont
(Independent)

JULIAN EPSTEIN, *Staff Director*
MATTHEW R. FLETCHER, *Minority Staff Director*

HUMAN RESOURCES AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York, *Chairman*

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
THOMAS M. BARRETT, Wisconsin
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
CRAIG A. WASHINGTON, Texas

STEVEN SCHIFF, New Mexico
STEPHEN HORN, California
JOHN L. MICA, Florida

BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont (Ind.)

EX OFFICIO

JOHN CONYERS, Jr., Michigan

WILLIAM F. CLINGER, Jr., Pennsylvania

RONALD A. STROMAN, *Staff Director*
ALLEGRA PACHECO, *Professional Staff Member*
MARTINE M. DiCROCE, *Clerk*
MARTHA MORGAN, *Minority Counsel*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on October 19, 1993	1
Statement of:	
Payzant, Thomas, Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education; and Luther Williams, Assistant Director for Education and Human Resources, National Science Foundation	8
Simering, Jeff, Washington representative, Chicago Board of Education; Robert E. Slavin, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, Johns Hopkins University; and Kati Haycock, Director of Education Trust, American Association for Higher Education	34
Simmons, Sharon Edwards, supervisor of Early Childhood Education, New York City Public Schools; Gerard G. Leeds, cochairperson of the Institute for Community Development; and Doctor Lavinia Dickerson ...	89
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by:	
Fernandez, Joe, president, Council of Great City Schools, prepared statement of	37
Haycock, Kati, Director of Education Trust, American Association for Higher Education, prepared statement of	72
Leeds, Gerard G., cochairperson of the Institute for Community Development, prepared statement of	101
Payzant, Thomas, Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, prepared statement of	11
Simmons, Sharon Edwards, supervisor of Early Childhood Education, New York City Public Schools, prepared statement of	92
Slavin, Robert E., Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, Johns Hopkins University, prepared statement of	53
Towns, Hon. Edolphus, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, prepared statement of	3
Williams, Luther, Assistant Director for Education and Human Resources, National Science Foundation, prepared statement of	24

H.R. 3130, THE IMPROVING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS ACT OF 1993: THE IMPLICATIONS FOR URBAN DISTRICTS

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1993

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES AND
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 1 p.m., in room 2247, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Edolphus Towns (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Towns and Mica.

Staff Present: Ronald A. Stroman, staff director; Allegra Pacheco, professional staff member; Martine M. DiCroce, clerk; and Martha Morgan, minority counsel.

Mr. TOWNS. The hearing on H.R. 3130, "The Improving America's Schools Act of 1993" and the implications for urban districts will now come to order.

This begins the subcommittee's hearing on H.R. 3130—"The Improving America's Schools Act of 1993" and the implications for urban districts. Today we are focusing on the administration's re-targeting proposal and title II of H.R. 3130—professional development.

Over one-fifth of the children in our Nation live in poverty: that amounts to nearly 11.5 million children. Of these, 39.8 percent are African-American and 32 percent are Hispanic, many of whom live in our inner cities. With such a high concentration of impoverished children living in urban centers, the purpose of this hearing is to draw attention to the impact the administration's bill will have on the education of poor children in these areas.

It has become far too accepted that minority and low-income children do not perform educationally as well as other children. Most uninformed people attribute the discrepancy in scores or achievement rates to the children themselves, their parents or even the culture from where these children come from. These excuses serve only to perpetuate the cycle of low-achievement as many educators become accustomed to expecting less from these children and give less in return.

Educators from all over the country, and some we are honored to have here today, have already demonstrated outstanding methods and approaches to use in educating poor and minority children.

The administration's bill now attempts on a nationwide level to encourage successful teaching methods in all schools.

Additionally, H.R. 3130 attempts to further target chapter 1 money to the most needy school districts in our Nation. The proposed improvements would result in the highest poverty counties receiving a 15-percent increase in chapter 1 funding and the lowest poverty counties losing 34 percent of their chapter 1 funds. I know that the 625,000 impoverished children in the great State of New York will benefit greatly from this shift of funds and I applaud the administration for recognizing the importance of high standards and increased funding for schools with the highest concentration of poverty children.

I support H.R. 3130, but as Chair of this subcommittee I am concerned about some parts of the proposal. My specific concerns deal with the allocation of the majority of Federal funds to schools and allowing them to commingle this money with other Federal discretionary funds without a specific, focused, and enforceable monitoring and assessment process to oversee the application of this funding. I am also concerned about the absence of a coordinated effort to establish consistent professional development guidelines on both the Federal and State level. I agree with the administration that professional development is essential to any school reform program, but the standards by which we embark on training our teachers must be consistent all the way through. The purpose of this hearing will be to focus on these concerns and gather comments and recommendations from experts in the field, people that are out there making the difference day in and day out.

As you can see from the witness list, we have an ambitious agenda. We will apply the 5-minute rule. We have a light there that we put on, and, of course, it starts out green, and then it switches to red, and when it becomes red that means that your 5 minutes are up, just in case you lose yourself in your testimony. And, I ask for everyone to please cooperate in this, which will allow us to raise some questions and cover the entire subject matter.

Before we hear from our witnesses, I would like to yield at this time to a member of the subcommittee from the great State of Florida, Congressman Mica, for any remarks that he might like to make at this time.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Edolphus Towns follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE EDOLPHUS TOWNS,
CHAIRMAN

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES AND
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

HEARING ON: "H.R. 3130 – THE IMPROVING AMERICA'S SCHOOL ACT
OF 1993: THE IMPLICATIONS FOR URBAN DISTRICTS"

WILL THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES AND
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS PLEASE COME TO ORDER.

THIS BEGINS THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S HEARING ON H.R. 3130 –
"THE IMPROVING AMERICA'S SCHOOL ACT OF 1993" AND THE
IMPLICATIONS FOR URBAN DISTRICTS. TODAY WE ARE FOCUSING
ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S RE-TARGETING PROPOSAL AND TITLE II
OF H.R. 3130 – PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

OVER ONE-FIFTH OF THE CHILDREN IN OUR NATION LIVE IN
POVERTY: THAT AMOUNTS TO NEARLY 11.5 MILLION CHILDREN.

OF THESE, 39.8% ARE AFRICAN-AMERICAN AND 32% ARE HISPANIC, MANY OF WHOM LIVE IN OUR INNER CITIES. WITH SUCH A HIGH CONCENTRATION OF IMPOVERISHED CHILDREN LIVING IN URBAN CENTERS, THE PURPOSE OF THIS HEARING IS TO DRAW ATTENTION TO THE IMPACT THE ADMINISTRATION'S BILL WILL HAVE ON THE EDUCATION OF POVERTY CHILDREN IN THESE AREAS.

IT HAS BECOME FAR TOO ACCEPTED THAT MINORITY AND LOW-INCOME CHILDREN DO NOT PERFORM EDUCATIONALLY AS WELL AS OTHER CHILDREN. MOST UNINFORMED PEOPLE ATTRIBUTE THE DISCREPANCY IN SCORES OR ACHIEVEMENT RATES TO THE CHILDREN THEMSELVES, THEIR PARENTS OR EVEN THE CULTURE FROM WHERE THESE CHILDREN COME FROM. THESE EXCUSES SERVE ONLY TO PERPETUATE THE CYCLE OF LOW-ACHIEVEMENT AS MANY EDUCATORS BECOME ACCUSTOMED TO EXPECTING LESS FROM THESE CHILDREN AND GIVE LESS IN RETURN.

THE IMPROVING AMERICA'S SCHOOL ACT OF 1993 – H.R. 3130 - COUNTERS THIS TREND. IT ATTEMPTS TO HAVE STATES IMPOSE HIGH STANDARDS FOR ALL CHILDREN IN HIGH-POVERTY SCHOOLS

SO THAT EACH CHILD WILL FEEL HIS OR HER IMPORTANCE AND SELF-WORTHINESS. UNDER THIS ACT, TEACHERS AND OTHER EDUCATORS ALIKE WILL BE OBLIGATED TO CONTINUE TO EXPECT THE CHILD TO SUCCEED AT THE SAME LEVEL AS OTHER CHILDREN IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT.

EDUCATORS FROM ALL OVER THE COUNTRY, AND SOME WE ARE HONORED TO HAVE HERE TODAY, HAVE ALREADY DEMONSTRATED OUTSTANDING METHODS AND APPROACHES TO USE IN EDUCATING POOR AND MINORITY CHILDREN. THE ADMINISTRATION'S BILL NOW ATTEMPTS ON A NATIONWIDE LEVEL, TO ENCOURAGE SUCCESSFUL TEACHING METHODS IN ALL SCHOOLS.

ADDITIONALLY, H.R.3130 ATTEMPTS TO RE-TARGET CHAPTER 1 MONEY TO THE MOST NEEDY SCHOOL DISTRICTS. THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS WOULD RESULT IN THE HIGHEST-POVERTY COUNTIES RECEIVING A 15 PERCENT INCREASE IN CHAPTER 1 FUNDING AND THE LOWEST-POVERTY COUNTIES LOSING 34 PERCENT OF THEIR CHAPTER 1 FUNDS. I KNOW THAT THE 625,000

IMPOVERISHED CHILDREN IN THE GREAT STATE OF NEW YORK WILL BENEFIT GREATLY FROM THIS SHIFT OF FUNDS AND I APPLAUD THE ADMINISTRATION FOR RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF HIGH STANDARDS AND INCREASED FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS WITH THE HIGHEST CONCENTRATION OF POVERTY CHILDREN.

I SUPPORT H.R. 3130, BUT AS CHAIR OF THIS SUBCOMMITTEE I AM CONCERNED ABOUT SOME PARTS OF THE PROPOSAL. MY SPECIFIC CONCERNS DEAL WITH THE ALLOCATION OF THE MAJORITY OF FEDERAL FUNDS TO SCHOOLS AND ALLOWING THEM TO COMMINGLE THIS MONEY WITH OTHER FEDERAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDS WITHOUT A SPECIFIC, FOCUSED AND ENFORCEABLE MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT PROCESS TO OVERSEE THE APPLICATION OF THIS FUNDING. I AM ALSO CONCERNED ABOUT THE ABSENCE OF A COORDINATED EFFORT TO ESTABLISH CONSISTENT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES ON BOTH THE FEDERAL AND STATE LEVEL. I AGREE WITH THE ADMINISTRATION THAT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IS ESSENTIAL TO ANY SCHOOL REFORM PROGRAM, BUT THE STANDARDS BY WHICH WE EMBARK ON TRAINING OUR TEACHERS

MUST BE CONSISTENT ALL THE WAY THROUGH. THE PURPOSE OF THIS HEARING WILL BE TO FOCUS ON THESE CONCERNS AND GATHER COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EXPERTS IN THE FIELD.

Mr. MICA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I do want to commend you for holding this hearing today and bringing together witnesses who will testify and provide some light on what the administration's plans are for this effort in improving our education, and also from hearing from some of the experts who have dealt specifically with some of these programs. We need to learn their successes. We need to learn the failures of the past, and see how we can improve.

Certainly when we are spending \$6.1 billion of the taxpayers' money, and sometimes we have questionable results, I think we need to look at how we can do a better job. So, very briefly, I do want to commend you, Chairman Towns, for conducting this hearing.

I look forward to the testimony of our witnesses, and look forward to working with you in an effort to see that we can do a better job for what the taxpayers are paying for their educational dollars.

Thank you.

Mr. TOWNS. Thank you very much, Congressman Mica, and also thank you for your involvement. He is one that's always trying to make certain that we get a better bang for our buck, so I also want to thank you for that.

Mr. TOWNS. At this time, I would like to call the witnesses. First of all, I would like to call the Honorable Thomas Payzant, the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, if you will take your seat.

I'd also like to call on Dr. Luther Williams, Assistant Director of Education and Human Resources from the National Science Foundation.

Gentleman, if you will, you can start. Maybe, Mr. Payzant, you start first, and then as indicated your entire statement will be included in the record, and, of course, after the testimony we would like to spend as much time as possible to raise some questions with you as well.

So, Mr. Payzant, you can begin.

STATEMENTS OF THOMAS PAYZANT, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; AND LUTHER WILLIAMS, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. PAYZANT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Congressman Mica, for the opportunity to be with you today and talk about the administration's proposal on the Improving America's Schools Act of 1993.

It is the embodiment of President Clinton's commitment to the children of America. We are very excited about the proposal and know that it is before you at a critical time.

The elementary and secondary education reauthorization is one of the most important initiatives that will come before Congress this year.

As you noted, Mr. Chairman, in your opening remarks, it is staggering to note in this country that one of five children live at or below the poverty line, and to recognize that in our major urban areas that that percentage and number are much, much higher.

We also know that during the 1980's the number of limited English proficient children increased by 28 percent in our country. I can tell you about the 10 years that I was superintendent in San Diego. When I went to San Diego in 1982-83 there were 8,000 limited English proficient children, and when I left last spring there were 32,000 limited English proficient children of 125,000 students in that school district.

And, we know the recent surveys completed for the Department of Education found that more than two-thirds of American fourth, eighth, and twelfth graders are not proficient readers, and that more than half of American adults have difficulty with common tasks that require reading. So, we know that there have to be some dramatic changes, and in saying that we are not casting blame and suggesting that there haven't been good things that have resulted from the Elementary and Secondary Education Acts in the past. We know that chapter 1 in the past has succeeded in improving basic skills for disadvantaged students, that as a result of our drug-free schools funds, we have helped support the implementation of programs and policies to prevent drug abuse.

I know I only have a couple of minutes to summarize, but I'd like to briefly hit the five major themes or principles that are so important and tie all the pieces of this proposal together. It is not a collection of individual programs, but a set of proposals that if taken together will present a strategy for comprehensive school improvement where the whole really is greater than the sum of its parts.

The first principle is based on high standards for all students, not a two-tiered system where we treat those who are served by title I in one way, with a set of lower expectations than those that we have had for our most successful students in the past. We must have the same high standards for all.

Second, a focus on teaching and learning, with a heavy commitment to professional development because it is our teachers, principals, and other educators in our classrooms that are going to engage kids and help them have the opportunity to reach those high standards.

Third, the importance of targeting our resources where the concentrations of need are greatest, and in sufficient amounts to really make a difference.

So, our proposal drives 50 percent of the funding in title I grants to LEAs to the quartile of counties that have the highest poverty rates, and by highest poverty rates we mean over 21 percent. The administration is committed, as shown by the \$700 million proposed increase in title I to provide additional dollars to help that targeting of the resources.

The fourth principle is flexibility, to give more flexibility to local school districts and schools in return for accountability for results and outcomes.

And finally, we know that the schools cannot do it alone, that there have to be partnerships and linkages with other agencies, most importantly, with parents, in order for us to work together to help young people meet the high standards of being successful in school.

This is a comprehensive reform package. The pieces do tie together, and taken as a whole we believe that it can have a signifi-

cant impact on improving schools and learning for all children in our country, so that they can meet the high standards and be productive workers, participants in a vibrant democracy, and contributors to the quality of life in our communities, as well as being self-fulfilled individuals in the year 2000 and beyond.

Thank you very much. I'd be delighted to take your questions at the appropriate time.

Mr. TOWNS. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Payzant follows:]

Statement of Thomas W. Payzant
Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education
U.S. Department of Education
Before the Subcommittee on Human Resources
and Intergovernmental Relations
House Committee on Government Operations

October 19, 1993

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today on the Improving America's Schools Act, the Administration's proposal for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and other elementary and secondary education programs administered by the Department of Education.

Mr. Chairman, the elementary and secondary education reauthorization will be one of the most important initiatives to come before this Congress. It is an embodiment of President Clinton's commitment to the children of America, and I believe it could not be considered at a more critical time. Let's look at some of the recent trends:

- o According to the 1990 Census, more children live in poverty than ever before, nearly one in five.
- o The Census also found that the number of limited English proficient children in America increased by 28 percent during the 1980's.
- o Recent surveys completed for the Department found that more than two-thirds of American 4th-, 8th-, and 12th-graders are not proficient readers and that more than

half of American adults have difficulty with common tasks that require reading.

The Administration believes that Federal elementary and secondary programs must be dramatically restructured to address more comprehensively the severe needs illustrated by these data. The ESEA was first enacted in 1965 and has, since that time, contributed to many improvements in American education. For example, the Title I program has succeeded in improving the basic skills of disadvantaged children, and Drug-Free Schools funds have supported the implementation of programs and policies to prevent drug abuse across the Nation. Yet the full potential of ESEA has not been realized. Program resources have not triggered the kinds of transforming, systemic changes that our schools, particularly those in poor communities, often need. Instead, program resources tend to address narrow, categorical issues and to operate apart from broader educational programs and reforms. It is time to do better.

The proposals in the Improving America's Schools Act reflect five major themes. The first is a firm belief that all children can achieve to high academic standards. Too often, many of our children, particularly those who are poor, limited English proficient, migrant, homeless, or have other special needs, are prisoners of our low expectations. Federal programs have tended to reflect and reinforce those expectations by emphasizing achievement in low-level basic skills. Yet research and the

experiences of other countries have shown that all children can benefit from a challenging, enriched curriculum.

Our bill would tie Federal programs to State and community educational reforms that stress high standards for all students. Curriculum, assessments, professional development, and other elements of education would all focus on this objective. Most notably, Title I would shift from providing remedial instruction intended to bring low-achieving children up to minimal levels of competency to a completely new objective of ensuring that all children benefit from educational reforms geared to achievement of high standards.

Our second theme is that there must be a new focus on teaching and learning. To achieve that aim, Federal programs must be reconfigured to ensure that high-quality professional development is an integral part of every educator's job. Too often in the past, teacher training programs funded under ESEA have been haphazard, brief, and ineffective and have had little connection to State and local reform efforts. Yet the research strongly suggests that, to bring about real changes in teaching and learning, professional development must be on-going, long-term, and well designed. Our proposal would respond to these findings by strengthening the professional development components of Title I, Bilingual Education, Indian Education, and other programs, and, in particular, by creating an Eisenhower

Professional Development program to support sustained, intensive, and high-quality professional development in all of the core academic subject areas.

The new Eisenhower program would fund a wide variety of professional development activities carried out by localities, States, and the Department. State and local activities would be guided by State plans that outline long-term strategies for obtaining and providing high-quality professional development. Funds would be channeled, to States and then communities, on the basis of childcounts and shares of Title 1 funding; the latter factor would ensure that poor urban and rural communities receive the extra resources they need to meet their particularly severe needs. State and local efforts would be assisted by a national program, funded through a six percent set-aside, that supports such activities as professional development institutes for teams of teachers, development of networks to facilitate interaction among teachers, and development of new methods of assessing educators for licensure and certification. As part of our administration of the program, we would work closely with the National Science Foundation and other Federal agencies to coordinate our professional development activities.

Our third major theme is that Federal resources must be targeted to communities and schools where the needs are greatest and in amounts sufficient to make a difference. We are concerned that,

in too many of our programs, funds are spread so thinly and across so many schools that they cannot provide meaningful and effective assistance to children in need of services. This is the case even though high-poverty schools face by far the greatest educational challenges. In response, our bill would target program resources more effectively. In Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies, by far the largest program, through a number of adjustments in the formulas we would drive approximately 50 percent of funding (an increase of 7 percent over the current law) to the quartile of counties that have the highest poverty rates.

Because I know the Subcommittee is particularly interested in this issue, let me describe what our Title I formula changes would mean for some urban counties with concentrations of children from poor families. These changes, in combination with the increase of almost \$700 million that the Administration has committed to putting into this program for fiscal year 1995, would give Kings County, New York an increase of more than 20 percent, or \$28.5 million, over its 1994 allocation. Other examples include Los Angeles County, California -- +16 percent; Harris County, Texas -- +15 percent; and Bernalillo County, New Mexico -- an increase of more than 14 percent. The formula changes would benefit not only poor inner-cities, but also the poorer rural areas, such as those in Appalachia, in the Mississippi Delta region, or along the border with Mexico. And

as the new formula fully phases in -- that is, as the impact of "hold-harmless" provisions, which protect other areas from precipitous declines, diminishes over time -- poor urban and rural areas will benefit even more. We have also proposed that a portion of Safe and Drug-Free Schools funds be directed to communities most affected by drug and violence problems, and made similar proposals in other programs to concentrate resources where needs are greatest.

The fourth theme is that schools and school districts must be given flexibility to implement reforms geared to their individual needs. That flexibility must be coupled with responsibility for achieving real gains in student performance. Our bill includes a number of provisions that respond to the need for greater local flexibility, tied to accountability for results. Among those proposals, we would lower the poverty threshold for adoption of Title I schoolwide approaches and permit those approaches to incorporate funding from other sources. Our bill would authorize the Secretary to grant waivers from Federal statutory and regulatory requirements that impede implementation of local reforms. And it would authorize start-up funds for charter schools that provide enhanced public school choice and are exempted from certain rules and regulations.

Each of these proposed initiatives includes a strong focus on results. That is, a continued allowance of flexibility in

operating Federal programs would depend on success in enabling students to master challenging academic content based on high standards.

The fifth and final major theme is that reaching high standards will require not just greater effort within our schools, but a strong partnership with parents and others in the community.

Studies have found that many parents do not encourage children to work hard and do their best in schools. For their part, schools do not always communicate effectively with parents; nor do they often assist at-risk children in obtaining the health and social services they need.

Our bill would address these problems through a number of measures. We would require that schools receiving Title I funds enter into compacts with parents that spell out the goals, expectations, and responsibilities of the parent and school. We also propose that school districts receiving Title I funds ensure the provision of health screenings for children in high-poverty elementary schools and be allowed to use Title I funds for those screenings if no other source of funding is available. And, as a response to the growing problem of violence in our schools and their surrounding neighborhoods, we propose to broaden the Drug-Free Schools program to allow funds to be used for violence prevention, as well as drug-prevention, efforts.

This concludes my brief overview of the Administration's legislative proposal. I would be happy to answer your questions.

Response to Questions from the House Government Operations
Subcommittee on H.R. 3130

Question 1: How will inner-city schools benefit under the Administration's bill?

Answer: The bill would provide new resources and incentives to communities and schools that serve many of the poorest children in the country, yet often have the least capacity to provide a quality education or implement comprehensive reforms. These schools, many of which are located in inner cities, would benefit especially from provisions to:

- o Target Title I funds more intensively and accurately to high-poverty schools. The bill would shift funds to school districts with above-average poverty rates. Districts would distribute funds to schools based on numbers of poor children, which would ensure that schools with the highest poverty rates, at any grade level, are served before less needy schools. We would also modify the within-State formula for the Drug-Free Schools program to target more funds on school districts with the greatest need.
- o Encourage school-level reforms in high-poverty schools, by expanding the number of schools eligible for Title I schoolwide projects.
- o Address health and other problems that hinder learning, by: (1) expanding the Drug-Free Schools program to allow funds to be used for violence prevention as well as drug prevention, (2) requiring school districts receiving Title I funds to ensure the provision of health screenings for children in high-poverty elementary schools, and (3) requiring all Title I schools to enter into compacts with parents that spell out their mutual responsibilities.

Question 2: How much additional funding will inner-city schools receive under the retargeting proposal?

Answer: With the \$700 million increase proposed by the Administration for Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies in fiscal year 1995, the targeting proposal would move \$500 million to school districts in the highest poverty quartile, raising their share of total funds from 43 percent to 50 percent. For example, St. Louis would gain 20 percent, more than \$3.8 million, over its 1994 allocation. New York City, Philadelphia, and Baltimore would each gain 18 percent. Other examples include Denver -- +17 percent and San Francisco -- +14 percent.

Question 3: Under H.R. 3130, how will the Department coordinate and implement professional development programs? What mechanisms will the Department use to evaluate teaching methods and educational approaches? How will the Department disseminate information for professional development to the school districts and to teachers themselves? What kind of technological approaches is the Department planning to coordinate professional development programs nationally?

Answer: The major professional development program of ESEA would be the Eisenhower Professional Development Program. This would be a formula state grant program that provides money to SEAs, LEAs, IHEs, and schools to promote professional development that is tied to state content standards.

The Eisenhower Professional Development Program would be coordinated with other professional development programs through the work of the comprehensive technical assistance centers. These centers would work directly with SEAs, LEAs and schools in the implementation of ESEA programs and their linkages with other programs. The comprehensive centers would be linked through a computer network that would help in the coordination of professional development programs both within ESEA as well as with other federal professional development activities.

The Department would disseminate information about professional development through the comprehensive ESEA technical assistance centers, the Department's nationwide electronic bulletin board, as well as the regional educational laboratories.

The Department would maintain its Program Effectiveness Panel that evaluates the effectiveness of educational programs, including those for instruction.

Question 4: What mechanisms will the Department use to assess the success of Chapter 1 programs? How does the Department define "educationally meaningful categories" under section 1111(b)(c)(F)? Will these categories include results by poverty, ethnicity, gender and disabilities? If not, why not?

Answer: Under the Administration's bill, the Department would assess the effectiveness of Title I programs in raising the performance of children in Title I schools by conducting a national evaluation of the program, using student performance data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress and information from the results of State assessments. The Department would also have the authority to collect data from States, LEAs, and schools on characteristics of eligible children and schools and how Title I funds are being used.

"Educationally meaningful categories" would include subgroups of children whose special educational needs are addressed by Title I and other Federal programs. The Administration believes that data for special populations are necessary to help assess the progress of all students in meeting challenging standards. However, the reauthorization bill does not define specific categories in order to reinforce the need for each State to scrutinize the educational relevancy and reliability of various groupings of children.

Question 5: How will the combination of technical centers into regional centers affect the implementation and success of Chapter 1 programs? What mechanisms will the Department put in place to assure that all populations are served by the regional technical centers?

Answer: The comprehensive technical assistance centers would be designed to improve the implementation and success of all ESEA programs. Each center would be required to have staff with expertise in each of the categorical programs and a mission to serve all populations in ESEA programs. Centers would be able to provide state and local educational agencies with assistance in how to implement ESEA programs in a manner that promotes coordination and supports systemic reform.

For Title I programs, the comprehensive centers would be able to provide assistance across a range of topics and in a coordinated manner. A Title I program would be able to receive assistance about various topics such as bilingual education and professional development as well as promising practices for school improvement. The comprehensive character of the assistance would ensure that Title I programs have better technical assistance that would improve the implementation and success of Title I programs.

Mr. TOWNS. Doctor Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman and Congressman Mica, it is, too, a pleasure to be here today to participate in this hearing on the Improving America's Schools Act of 1993: the Implications for Urban Districts. This committee's concern for the effectiveness of this proposal on the inner-city districts, as Tom has indicated, is both timely and, in my judgment, critically important.

I want you to know from the start my views on H.R. 3130. In my opinion, The Improving America's Schools Act of 1993 represents the most substantive and constructive proposed revision of the Elementary and Secondary Education act since its inception. Why? This is true because this proposed revision will occur in concert with the major effort by the Department to occasion systemic reform of education, as promoted by Goals 2000. Taking that effort, in combination with the fact that there are national education goals, and with the currently mathematics standards soon, soon to be available science standards, and standards for students' performance in other areas, there has been very much hope that it's possible to revitalize America's elementary and secondary schools, particularly, those in inner cities.

As has already been indicated, the transition of resources from communities with substantial resources to those of substantial poverty is noteworthy, but equally noteworthy is the fact that the Department will require the schools to submit a plan that renders explicit how, in fact, those funds will be employed to assist the students in meeting challenging standards.

And, leaving aside the previous accomplishments under chapter 1, and I concede there have been some, this, in my view, represents the first opportunity to break the status quo cycle that deals with low expectations that by definition leads to low performance and poor outcomes for students served by chapter 1, especially those in urban or inner-city schools.

The second reason I'm particularly pleased with this effort is that this general refocusing of resources by the Department for all subjects complements quite well the National Science Foundation's comprehensive effort that focuses entirely on K-12 math and science education.

This program, which is entitled "the Urban Systemic Initiative," focuses on the 25 cities that have the largest number of school-aged children, ages 5 to 17, living in poverty, according to the 1990 Census report. By both a very active set of interactions under a memorandum of understanding between the National Science Foundation and the Department, as well as the White House Federal Coordinating Council on Science, Engineering, and Technology that looks specifically at education, the two agencies have an excellent opportunity to collaborate in this very important effort.

In summary, to reiterate, the Improving America's Schools Act of 1993 constitutes a major step, if not, in my view, in recent times the singularly most important step, toward a yet to be realized societal objective, namely, the orderly provision of quality elementary and secondary education for all students, a circumstance, to say the least, that's not obtained presently.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity you have given me to appear at this hearing, and I will be responsive to your questions.

Mr. TOWNS. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Williams follows:]

REMARKS
OF LUTHER S. WILLIAMS
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

HEARING OF THE HUMAN RESOURCES
AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OCTOBER 19, 1993

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, it is a pleasure to be here today to participate in this hearing on, "The Improving America's Schools Act of 1993: The Implications for Urban Districts". The Committee's concern for the effects of this proposal on urban school districts in particular is both timely and critically important.

I want you to know from the start my views on H.R. 3130: I am of the opinion that the Improving America's Schools Act of 1993, represents the most substantive and constructive proposed revision of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act since its inception in 1965. This is especially the case when viewed in combination with the systemic reform efforts being promoted by Goals 2000. The combined impact of the systemic framework described in Goals 2000, the extant National Education Goals, the current mathematics standards and the emerging standards for science and other

subject areas will help revitalize America's elementary and secondary schools, including those in inner city districts.

Introduction

It is important that this Committee recognize the need to afford all students the opportunity for high quality K-12 education, in order to enhance the quality of life of all citizens and, thereby, promote the national welfare.

The Improving America's Schools Act of 1993

In its basic grant program, Chapter 1 of Title I, the Elementary and Secondary Act directed financial assistance to state and local educational agencies to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children at preschool, elementary and secondary levels. Part A of Title I, as proposed, would require states to submit plans to the U.S. Department of Education describing how children eligible under Title I would be assisted in meeting the challenging standards expected of all students. This, in my view, highly appropriate and otherwise laudable transition, breaks rank with the status quo cycle of low expectations leading to low performance/educational outcomes. It would afford Title I students a comparable opportunity to engage in high quality K-12 education. Specifically, the Act would support

activities designed to extend effective and equitable education to all students by:

- promoting challenging State content, teaching, and performance standards and programs to ensure that all students have the opportunity to learn to those standards;
- improving teaching and learning, through intensive, sustained and high-quality professional development (teacher enhancement);
- increasing flexibility in local/State initiatives and governance to promote improved student performance;
- linking schools and communities to better engage parents in the education of their children at school and at home and to integrate services provided to children; and
- targeting Title I resources to schools in greatest need.

NSF Role in the Context of The Act

A fundamental component of NSF's comprehensive K-12 science and mathematics education programming is the series of programs designed to promote systemic reform leading to standards-based science and mathematics education for all

students. These programs include the Statewide Systemic Initiative currently operating in 26 states, the Urban Systemic Initiative and a proposed Rural Systemic Initiative. These NSF programs would effectively complement the revised Title I Program, the Urban Systemic Initiative Program, and represents an excellent opportunity for a partnership with the revised ESEA. The Urban Systemic Initiative Program is aimed at the 25 cities with the largest number of school-age children (ages five-17) living in economic poverty, as determined by the 1990 census. Urban school systems enroll about half of all public school students in the U.S. and there is a disparity between the academic performance of urban students and that of their counterparts in suburban schools. When compared to other students, this group has lower aspirations, scores lower on achievement tests, enrolls in less demanding courses, and is less prepared for higher education, employment, and informed citizenship in a technologically sophisticated world. Planning grants have been made to seventeen (17) of the following eligible cities.

Atlanta	Dallas	Los Angeles	Philadelphia
Baltimore	Detroit	Miami	Phoenix
Boston	El Paso	Milwaukee	San Antonio
Cincinnati	Fresno	New York	San Diego
Cleveland			

The quite robust and substantive interactions between NSF and the Department of Education through the Federal Coordinating Committee for Science, Engineering and Technology/Committee on Education and Training and the Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies will ensure the requisite collaboration between the two programs as they relate to inner city school districts.

In summary, The Improving America's Schools Act of 1993 constitutes a major step toward a yet to be realized societal objective -- namely, quality elementary and secondary education for all children.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity you have given me to appear at this important hearing.

Mr. TOWNS. We almost didn't need the light. Both of you finished within the required time frame, and I'd like to just sort of thank you for that.

But, let me just sort of move to some questions that I have. First of all, let me say, I like the fact that you are targeting the resources. I think that that's very, very important. I think for too long that we have sort of ignored areas that had serious problems and did not deal with it, and then we just sort of continued our funding kind of formula in a way that did not help us direct.

But, let me just sort of raise the question, the Department informed the subcommittee that the administration proposal would target \$500 million, as I understand it, of the \$700 million increase in funding to high poverty schools out of the \$700 million \$500, and then the question I have, what happens to the remaining \$200 million, where does that go, what happens with that?

Mr. PAYZANT. The proposal that we've made takes the principle of targeting and concentration through various parts of the distribution of the dollars.

Right now, the basic formula grants represent 90 percent of the dollars and only 10 percent goes into concentration, under current law. Our proposal would move 50 percent into concentration and 50 percent for the basic formula grants.

In the distribution of the dollars from the Federal Government to the counties, with each stage of allocating the dollars from Federal to State, State to local school districts, school district to schools within the district, we push the concentration and targeting buttons, so that, it follows all the way through.

As a result of the overall shift in the percentage of the dollars going into concentration, that will have an impact beyond just the \$500 million that we're saying would move to the highest quartile poverty districts. So, it will be much more than \$500 million that will have the impact on the distribution of the dollars.

For example, at the school district level, when a school district determines what schools will be served within the school district, under our proposal the district will be required to distribute to each school a minimum of 80 percent of what the school district gets from the state for each poverty child. So that, if you had a school with 1,000 students, and 800 of them were poverty children, then the district would have to distribute to that school from its allocation from the State 800 times 80 percent of the dollars that are coming from the State.

Thus, the concentration, Mr. Chairman, pushes all the way through, and the impact will be more than just the \$500 million that shifts to the highest quartile poverty counties.

Mr. TOWNS. Let me raise another question with you. If a school district is not involved with the Technical Assistance Center, how would the Department disseminate information to that school district?

Mr. PAYZANT. We propose two things with respect to technical assistance. First, the 10 comprehensive centers, which you just alluded to will be in each of the Department's regional areas. Second, we propose a computer network which will link school districts and individual schools and provide access to information from the centers and the Department of Education in Washington on the imple-

mentation of Federal programs. There will be direct access through a computer network for basic information, and then support from the Technical Assistance Centers that will provide the opportunity for people to work with some local school districts to follow up on their problems.

And, I want to be very forthcoming with you about the problems of scale. We are talking about, roughly, a \$60 million investment in technical assistance for a \$10 billion plus program, and under the current system of various program assistance centers we can't serve each of the 100,000 schools in America, or each of the 15,000 school districts every time they have a request. We think under our proposal we'll serve at least as many as we are now, probably more, and more effectively.

Mr. TOWNS. All right.

Mr. time has expired on this round. Let me just say this, though, I plan to come back with a couple questions, and it's still not clear in my head what's going to happen to that \$200 million. You talked about the \$500 million more than you did the \$200 million, so I wanted you to know I'm going to come back with that, I need to know what's going to happen to the \$200 million.

Mr. PAYZANT. Fair enough.

Mr. TOWNS. I now yield to Congressman Mica.

Mr. MICA. You'll have to excuse my lack of knowledge in his area. I came out of business and found myself in government here in 10 months, so I'm getting up to speed on some of the programs.

Mr. PAYZANT. So am I, Congressman.

Mr. MICA. Although, years ago, I was educated as an educator, and my wife was a teacher, and had a change to visit some of the different programs since I've gotten elected.

Refresh my facts here, if you will. I heard, just thrown out, \$10 billion program, and I saw \$6 billion referred to, are these—is this all the same thing, title I?

Mr. PAYZANT. When I used the \$10 billion figure, I was talking about the total elementary and Secondary Education Act, of which we are proposing \$7 billion would go into title I.

Mr. MICA. \$7 billion.

Mr. PAYZANT. Yes.

Mr. MICA. It's now around 6?

Mr. PAYZANT. 6.3.

Mr. MICA. And, you are adding another \$700 million.

Mr. PAYZANT. Exactly.

Mr. MICA. And, the difference in the formula is that you will now—it will not be targeted, as I understand it, under this proposal to school districts that have a 21-percent poverty level, is that correct?

Mr. PAYZANT. Fifty percent of the dollars would go into the highest quartile poverty districts.

Mr. MICA. No, I'm talking about the whole program, the whole program, is there any change in that direction?

Mr. PAYZANT. Yes, there are several changes. One is that 50 percent of the dollars would go into the highest quartile poverty district, but also the threshold for participation changes. Under the current law, a county has to have 6,500 students in poverty or 15

percent of the county's student population, it will now increase to 18 percent and 6,500 students.

Mr. MICA. So, there are 15,000 school districts. How many school districts previously received assistance under the program, and how many—you know, what will be the shift?

Mr. PAYZANT. The shift? OK. Let me answer it in terms of counties first, because that data is clearer.

There are about 3,100 counties in the United States. Under the current law, all but about half a dozen counties participate in the current chapter 1, which under the administration's proposal we are calling title I. With the proposal that we've made, the number of counties of the 3,100 that would not participate would increase from 6 to about 105, so about 99 additional counties would not be able to participate under our proposal. That means, roughly 3,000 out of the 3,100 plus would continue to.

Now, within counties, most school districts participate. I can't give you an exact number off the top of my head, but we'll try to get that for you if you would like, but most participate, and will under our proposal, too.

Mr. MICA. Right now under title I, how many students are you serving? Do you have a figure, like we spent \$6.3 billion, how many students are we serving, what's the cost per student? You have to look at this as a business person, what it's costing.

Mr. PAYZANT. The averages are deceiving. I'm going to check with my friend here, about 5 million? Five and a half million students are being served, and about a \$1,000 per pupil is the average, but that's going to vary.

Mr. MICA. \$1,000 per pupil?

Mr. PAYZANT. Right. That's national average.

Mr. MICA. From this program.

Mr. PAYZANT. Yes.

Mr. MICA. And, how many will we be serving after this number of students, we are reducing the number of students we are serving, we are putting more money in. No? Yes? In the targeted areas, like, are we spending \$1,000 right now across the board per student, and in the future we are going to spend \$1,200 for the average student involved, and in the poverty area it's \$1,500? Is there any way to break that out?

Mr. PAYZANT. The \$1,000 figure is a national average, so what is spent in one State on average may be different from another.

The average would be pretty close to the same, but another part of our proposal is to expand the opportunity for schools to engage in school-wide programs. These would be schools with high concentrations of students in poverty. In that situation, the school can take the dollars and apply them for total school improvement and serve all of the students in the school.

In those instances, you would get more students receiving the impact than if you just had a situation where you were only identifying certain students within the school to be served. That's why it's hard to give you a precise number. It would depend, in large part, on the number of schools that took advantage of school-wide projects and served all the children.

Mr. MICA. So, this money goes in block, then, to the school district?

Mr. PAYZANT. That's correct.

Mr. MICA. Now, excuse me, Doctor Williams, you said that they are required to prepare a plan on how to spend it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. MICA. And, the proposal has in the flexibility, you know, is that something new? this is more flexible than in the past, so they can spend it as they—

Mr. WILLIAMS. There's more flexibility, but I repeat, I think the most important part of this bill is the plan. While admittedly, it's important to concentrate—increase resources in areas of greatest need, obviously, if we are going to serve all the students that certainly should be the societal objective.

But, the reason I'm extremely pleased with the development is beyond the dollars or the amount per student which you were just going through. What does it need, and what this Act now says is that there will be standards-based education.

Mr. MICA. In other words, we give you \$1,000 a student, or \$1,200, whatever it is, and before this we had x number of dummies, and afterwards we shouldn't have as many dummies, as far as reading, and writing, and math, the basic skills, is that part of this new approach?

Mr. WILLIAMS. that is, in my judgment, the guts of it. That is the approach.

Mr. MICA. Do they get dropped, is there a penalty, or do they just get—continue to get the money under the new plan if they don't produce?

Mr. PAYZANT. There is an accountability system built in, and there is a proposed change in assessment. Schools would be responsible for demonstrating annual progress to show the extent to which students are or are not making progress towards reaching the high standards.

If a school did not show success over 2 years, then there would be a trigger mechanism that would identify the need for help, support, and technical assistance to do whatever it takes to start turning things around.

If that didn't result in improvement, then the local district would be required to take corrective action after a period of time, which could include changing the principal, changing the staff at the school, giving parents the option to send their children to other schools.

As the school district would monitor the progress or lack of progress of the schools, the State would likewise monitor the progress or lack of progress of the districts.

Mr. MICA. Well, just a final comment, if I might. In visiting schools, and just meeting with some of the school superintendents that I've had a chance to meet with, their observation is, the Federal programs become an exercise in a lot of reporting and requirements for paper work, which is driving them bananas, to put it mildly. And, the results doesn't seem to be that good.

The title I projects, I think I visited one which was a combination of volunteers, bringing in the local universities or community college, some professionals, I think, that were funded by this, to provide some enhanced educational opportunities, and then the regulator school staff, that seemed to be about the best combination

that I saw of these people working together in a concerted effort to assist people.

The other point that I seem to hear too, and I'm not sure how far into the school system this program goes, but most everyone is telling me, if we haven't gotten them by the third grade that we are headed for disaster. So, I'm not sure if these resources—I see they are concentrated in poverty level, but are they concentrated in proportion at the elementary level, where it's so important to catch them before they become the discipline problem, the classroom problem, the educational problem, the drop-out problem.

Mr. PAYZANT. Not exclusively at the elementary level. Our proposal has a provision in it that would require school districts to serve all schools in the district that have a 75-percent poverty level or above. That would mean high schools, middle schools, or elementary schools.

I do not deny your observation about the necessity of catching children early and focusing on prevention. The other side of that coin is that some of our most difficult schools in America, and ones that aren't working as well as they need to, are some of our middle schools and high schools, and we can't write off a generation of teenaged young people, given what we face in America. We think that there ought to be a focus on those school as well, but not to the exclusion of the early childhood years:

Mr. MICA. Is there a percentage of how this money is distributed?

Mr. PAYZANT. What we say is that if a school has a level of 75 percent poverty or above, the school district would have to serve all of those schools before it could decide to put the rest of its money just into elementary, or certain grade levels beyond that.

If they didn't have 75-percent poverty, then they could make the call the way they wanted to.

Mr. MICA. I think we have a vote. I'll yield back.

Mr. TOWNS. Yes. Let me indicate, we do have a vote, and what I would like to do is just vote and then come right back.

Mr. MICA. I'll be back, too.

Mr. TOWNS. OK.

[Recess.]

Mr. TOWNS. I know that there was a commitment made that we have you out by 2 p.m. and we want to live up to that commitment, so we are prepared to let you go at this time, but we would like to do one of two things, maybe to submit some questions for you to answer later, or to arrange to just sort of talk to you further another time in another hearing, because we do have some questions, and I don't fault you for—it was actually in terms of our fault, the fact that we had those votes.

But, here again, I'm prepared to let you go at this time, because I know in terms of your schedule and the commitment that was made in advance, so thank you very much, Doctor Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you.

Mr. TOWNS. We'll be submitting some questions for you, and also you, too, Mr. Payzant, as well.

Mr. PAYZANT. Mr. Chairman, if I might just take 30 seconds, because I hate to leave you with ambiguity about the earlier question you asked, and then to, do either or both of what you suggest, ei-

ther submit questions that we'll respond to, or I'd be happy to come back, on the \$700 million, the \$500 million does really shift in terms of concentration.

What I didn't mention in my response was that there is a hold harmless provision that is included to try to mitigate the impact on those States, countries, and school districts that will lose dollars as a result of the shift in money. And so, a good portion of the additional money would be to cover that hold harmless, which is at the 85-percent level in the first year, so that nobody would get less than 85-percent of the previous year's allocation in the first year of implementation of our proposal.

Mr. TOWNS. All right. Thank you very much for clearing that up and we appreciate that.

So, thank you again for coming to testify, and we apologize for running over, because we didn't anticipate the votes.

Thank you.

Mr. PAYZANT. Thank you.

Mr. TOWNS. At this time, we'd like to call Jeff Simering, Washington representative, Chicago Board of Education, Dr. Robert E. Slavin, Dr. Kati Haycock. Let me thank all of you, and I apologize again for the delay, but when you get called to vote you have to do that, or else they put your name in the New York Times that you did not vote, so that's what we were doing, going over to vote, and we might be called back again, I understand, but let's hope that that will not occur.

Why don't we begin with you, Mr. Simering.

STATEMENTS OF JEFF SIMERING, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE, CHICAGO BOARD OF EDUCATION; ROBERT E. SLAVIN, CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY; AND KATI HAYCOCK, DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION TRUST, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. SIMERING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As is obvious at this point, I am not Joe Fernandez, president of the Council of Great City Schools. Joe extends his apologies to the committee. He was up, ready to testify today, and he got himself significantly under the weather, so I'm going to attempt to stand in here.

I've also been directed to extend her warmest greetings to you, from our new superintendent with the Chicago Board of Education, R.D. Johnson, who was a former constituent of yours. I was with her at the end of last week, and she directed me specifically to come in and say hello, whether I was testifying or not.

Mr. TOWNS. Thank you so much. I really appreciate that. It's someone that we have great respect for, and please convey my wishes to her.

Mr. SIMERING. I will do do.

I am testifying on behalf of the Council of the Great City Schools, the organization that represents the 47 largest urban public school systems. We also represent 13 percent of the Nation's total public enrollment.

I would like to report to you that the Council of Great City Schools enthusiastically supports the Clinton administration's re-

authorization proposal for elementary and secondary education. The tones, the theme, the focus of the entire package, we feel, will help significantly advance school reform, improve school improvement across the board.

We particularly want to emphasize our strong support for the administration's title I proposal. We also support the renewed emphasis on staff development that we see in the bill, the recognition of the serious educational technology needs in the Nation, the new initiative on school violence, as well as the continuation of a separate bilingual education program.

I would like to just basically highlight five areas of ESEA reauthorization that address the implications for urban school districts from the particular perspective of the Council of the Great City Schools.

In terms of benefit for the urban school districts, if passed in present form, we feel that this package that the administration has proposed would be significantly beneficial to the large city school systems. The increased targeting in the chapter 1 program will provide us with some significant increased dollars.

While various cities have different concentrations of poor children, the poorest cities on the whole would receive an increase of approximately 5 to 10 percent, at least from our estimation, in the first year of implementation at current funding levels.

I know the administration has made some projections on going to \$7 billion, but at current funding levels we would estimate a 5 to 10 percent increase. For example, in Houston we would estimate it to go up to about 5 percent, New York City to about 10 percent increase, L.A. to about 6 percent increase, and that would be in the first year.

If current funding levels continued, we think that there would be a small measure of increases in the out years, and hopefully there would be some appropriations increases as well, which would magnify the targeting that's proposed by the Administration.

Beyond the funding benefits of the proposed bill, the additional flexibility, the lowering of thresholds for school-wide projects we think is a fairly significant benefit. The continuation of individual student eligibility for schools below the school-wide project threshold, we think, however, is very important to maintain.

You mentioned in your opening remarks, Mr. Chairman, some concern about the measuring of the success of the chapter 1 program. As stated in the current bill, the measuring of the success of the chapter 1 program appears to be on the school as a whole, and we think it isn't much of a greater leap to also require disaggregating the results for the target population, the eligible chapter 1 children. We think we should know how the target population is performing, as well as know how the overall school is performing.

In addition, and maybe it's my simplistic approach to program evaluation, but I would also like to know, and I would like to see measured what is being taught. So, to some extent, I think it would be useful to know what are the subject areas in some of these schools that are actually being taught, as opposed to just having an evaluation that's across all the four subject areas, which seems to be increasing as the Goals 2000 bills moves through Congress.

The council strongly suggests, therefore, that additional categories be placed in statute to require this aggregated reporting.

The other areas that we have some difficulty with is that funding has been consolidated, and, basically, it looks like in the proposal we are robbing Peter to pay Paul, so with the terminations of some programs it appears that they are paying for any increases in others, and we have some significant problems with that.

I'll close my remarks and this point and be ready for any questions.

Mr. TOWNS. Thank you very much for your testimony.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Fernandez follows:]

Testimony
on the
Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act
"Improving America's Schools Act of 1993"
before the
Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations
of the
Committee on Government Operations
U.S. House of Representatives
by the
Council of the Great City Schools

Mr. Chairman, my name is Joseph Fernandez and I am the President of the Council of the Great City Schools. Before coming to the Council in July, I was Chancellor of the New York City Public Schools and Superintendent of the Dade County Public Schools. I appreciate this opportunity to testify this morning before this distinguished panel on the Clinton Administration's proposals to reauthorize the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Currently in its 37th year, the Council of the Great City Schools is a national organization comprised of 47 of the nation's largest urban public school systems. On our Board of Directors sit the Superintendent and one Board of Education member from each city, making the Council the only independent education group so constituted and the only one whose membership and purpose is solely urban.

The Council's membership serves about 5.4 million urban youngsters, or about 13.1% of the nation's public school enrollment. Approximately 75% of our enrollments are African American, Hispanic and Asian American; 13% are limited English; and nearly 57% are eligible for a free or reduced price lunch.

Mr. Chairman, the Council is pleased to report that it enthusiastically supports the Clinton Administration's reauthorization proposal for elementary and secondary education. The tone, themes, and focus of the package should help advance the efforts of our urban schools in their efforts to reform and to improve student performance.

The Council wants to highlight particularly its strong support for the Title I proposal. We welcome the three-pronged emphasis in the proposal on: increased academic performance and higher standards for all, targeted funding to sites with significant numbers or percentages of poor children, and enhanced accountability using multiple measures of performance. We would actually go a step further in accountability by requiring not merely the reporting of whole school performance, but also the disaggregated reporting of the specific performance of Title I students.

We also strongly endorse the continuation of individual student eligibility for Title I below the school-wide project levels and the general approach for lowering the eligibility thresholds for those projects. Moreover, the redefinition of eligible schools, based on poverty rather than test scores, will help the stability of the program and deserves support. In addition, the proposal to redesign the assessment system in the program to focus more on sample data is one the bill's most attractive features.

The Council also strongly supports the renewed emphasis in the bill on staff development, the recognition of serious educational technology needs, the new initiative to address school violence and the continuation of a separate bilingual education program.

Finally, the Council strongly endorses the attempt by the Department of Education to concentrate precious federal dollars onto school districts with unusually high numbers or percentages of Title I children, and believes that the specifics of their proposal present a constructive framework from which inevitable negotiations can take place. The Council offers its technical and other capacities to the Committee as it considers these important items.

On balance, the Administration's proposal is extremely strong and warrants Congress' immediate consideration.

In that spirit, the Council would like to express some general overarching concerns about the legislation and some preliminary technical observations and recommendations about how we think the bill could be strengthened.

I. General Concerns

The Council's most general concern with the new proposal to reauthorize ESEA relates to what is missing. The first involves issues of funding. It appears that any authorized funding increases in the bill are generated at the expense of other programs, rather than through a proposed increase in the federal investment. We find this disappointing.

In a similar vein, the reauthorization proposal is lacking a substantive urban and rural initiative to assist those schools furthest away from the national goals and standards. Even the Administration's own modest urban/rural budget initiative is missing from the package.

This is the last federal reauthorization of ESEA before the year 2000, something that Congress should take full advantage of as it prods America's schools to reform and improve. The package as presented, unfortunately, does not expand the federal role or federal education programming much beyond that of twenty years ago. It is the belief of the Council that Congress should seize this moment in history and seriously expand its level of programming however grim the immediate budget situation, even if it only creates a general shell in which to place a serious funding or trust fund proposal.

This concern over funding extends to issues of state fairness and adequacy of funding which the bill itself raises. Providing technical assistance to states unwilling to address their inequities politically is both inadequate and misses the point.

In addition, the Council is seriously concerned about the elimination of any federal programmatic response to national goal # 2, dropout prevention. This major national problem has literally slipped off the federal radar screen with this proposal. While not insisting on the restoration of the current dropout prevention demonstration grants, the Council does believe that sustained federal programming is necessary and has obviously been helpful in reducing the national dropout rates, particularly in inner-city schools. We urge Congress to address this problem.

Also troubling in the package is the absence of a program that would address the influx of immigrant students into our schools. The proposal in ESEA Title VII is more of a retrenchment than an initiative.

Finally, any attempt at addressing the educational infrastructure needs in the nation is missing in the proposed package. Such any initiative is critical in the cities if our reforms are to be complete.

Overall, there are three problems which tend to crosscut the ESEA package. First, there appears, ironically, to be an expanded role for the "middle-man" in our national educational deliver system. Reservations and set-asides for SEAs, Governors, and IHEs have continued, if not increased in the new proposal. With caps on federal domestic budget growth, these mediator-agencies, which are inserted between the federal funding agency and the local delivery system, serve to deprive children of essential program funds. Additionally, the Administration has resurrected the local match even in certain formula grant programs. Given the pressures on local school budgets, particularly in the big cities, these new local matching requirements are unrealistic and counterproductive. Finally, there appears to be a proliferation of "plans" and often multiple "plans" in nearly every program. The Council is concerned that these multiple plans will result in significantly increased paperwork, rather than desired decreases in burden. While we are pleased that the proposed bill may not require the LEAs to submit six feet worth of paperwork to the State in order to secure grant approval, the reauthorization proposal may still require us to produce the same amount of paper in the planning process.

The increased level of paperwork and the ambiguity of certain proposed language could create increased audit problems as well.

The Council appreciates the Subcommittee's continuing interest in education and your specific interest in the content of the Federal government's main vehicle for assisting our public schools, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. For that reason our analysis has gone beyond merely those issues which impact directly upon our city membership, and has also addressed those areas of the bill which relate to efficient and cost effective operation of the national educational agenda at the federal, state and local levels. Please recognize our willingness to be of assistance in any area of the reauthorization.

II. Additional Technical Concerns

PROBLEM: The July 1, 1995 effective date for the bill would prohibit schools from implementing the reforms contained in the bill for a full school year after enactment.

RECOMMENDATION: Utilize the current law: transition language of Title I, Chapter 1, Sec. 1491 (c) to allow the use of either the new law or the current law during a transition year beginning July 1, 1994.

TITLE I, Sec. 1002 - Authorization of Appropriations

PROBLEM: The proposed bill allows States to reserve up to 1% of the county allocations allotted to that State for state administration. These county allocations issued by Washington in mid-March of each year are used by LEAs for budgetary planning purposes. Not knowing how much the State will take off-the-top of the county allotments will make early funding level predictability and planning more difficult for the LEAs.

RECOMMENDATION: Since the Appropriations Committee tends to line-item State Administration anyway, a separate authorization of appropriation subsection should be added to sec. 1002 at not more than one percent of the LEA Grants amount or the proper minimum.

TITLE I, Sec. 1111(b)(3)(F) - Assessment Requirements

PROBLEM: The proposed bill appears to ignore any separate reporting of the performance of the program's target population, the Title I eligible child receiving program services. Without disaggregating assessment results for the eligible population, the performance reported for the entire school could mask continued educational stagnation of the service population. With many Title I schools having less than 20% poverty, disaggregated reporting would ensure program accountability for the progress of the Title I child.

RECOMMENDATION: Include in the language on disaggregated results for "educationally meaningful categories of children", a requirement to disaggregate results for eligible children served by the program.

TITLE I, Sec. 1111 (c) - Other Provisions (vis-a-vis state plans)

PROBLEM: The proposed bill contains no description of the input role which the Committee of Practitioners will play in carrying out Title I in the states. Of particular interest are the establishment of the required performance levels, the pivotal definition of "adequate yearly progress", the review of the variety of improvement plans and other plans required of the locals, the development of the support team process, etc. The local programs must involve, consult, and work with almost everyone, while the States are often allowed to operate in a vacuum.

RECOMMENDATION: Replicate at the state level the peer review process established at the federal level for state plans. Utilize the Committee of Practitioners for that role and for input into other program areas such as listed above. A revised sec. 1111(c) should require the State to describe the

TITLE I, Sec. 1111(d) - Federal Peer Review Process

PROBLEM: There is no indication in the proposed bill of the composition of the peer review team which will review all state plans at the federal level. The peer review panel should include representation of local practitioners rather than just state agency officials or academics.

RECOMMENDATION: *Include local practitioners in the federal peer review panel.*

TITLE I, Sec. 1112(c)(3)(C) - Local Plans (two required health screenings)

PROBLEM: While the health of young students is critical to their academic success and interagency coordination to secure such services is desirable, the proposed language which requires LEAs to "ensure" two health screenings could make the LEA the "payor of last resort" if other funds or linkages do not produce the funding for the screenings.

RECOMMENDATION: *Revise the language to "designed to ensure", in order to make the use of Title I funds for such screenings permissive rather than mandatory.*

TITLE I, Sec. 1113(a)(1)(A)(i)(II) - Eligible School Attendance Areas

PROBLEM: The proposed bill requires attendance area eligibility to be established by percentage of poverty above the average in the LEA. Under this method a small school with a high percentage would be eligible, while a very large school with huge numbers of poor children and a lower percentage of poverty could be ineligible. Current law focuses on the concept of concentrations of poverty which allows high numbers or high percentages of poverty to be used in determining eligible schools. Since the number of eligible schools can be no more than the absolute number eligible under either the percentage or numerical methods, there is no significant dilution of funds which would result from allowing the local flexibility to serve the greatest concentrations of poor children.

RECOMMENDATION: *Revise the eligible school attendance area definition to reference "concentration" of percentages or numbers of children from low-income families instead of simply "percentage".*

TITLE I, Sec. 1113(a)(1)(B) - Eligible School Attendance Areas

PROBLEM: The proposed bill requires annual rankings of school attendance areas for determining eligibility. Therefore, each year a number of schools may fall in or out of Title I eligibility, resulting in hundreds of thousands of dollars being either added or deleted from the budgets of those school programs. The proposed bill also allows no "grandfathering" of schools as under current law. While apparently not a required submission to the SEA, the annual ranking process could be both a major paperwork endeavor and a barrier to educational service continuity for poor children.

RECOMMENDATION: *Require ranking attendance areas no more often than every three years, while allowing the local flexibility to serve newly eligible schools or drop no-longer eligible schools during the three year period based on local conditions.*

TITLE I, Sec. 1113(c) - Allocations

PROBLEM: A significant number of unintended consequences are anticipated as a result of the inflexibilities in this proposed allocation provision. The proposed bill requires allocations based purely on the number of poor students, while current law allows for consideration of not only the number of educationally deprived students, but also their level of academic need and the type of program services which are to be delivered. The proposed bill also requires each school to receive at least eighty percent of the per pupil amount granted to the LEA, which appears at variance with the

inflexibility of the preceding in-district allocation provision. While there is broad agreement on not rewarding academic stagnation by allocating funds on the basis of educational deprivation, the proposed language would not allow variations in allocations based on the type of program services to be delivered. For example, providing an early childhood intervention program in a school, an innovative experimental program in another, or even a school-wide project may require funding allocations which are higher than other types of services. This allocation flexibility is particularly important since the proposed bill has eliminated the specific "Innovative Projects" authority from Title I. In short, the LEA needs to have the ability to address different types of programs at the school level with appropriately measured allocations.

RECOMMENDATION: Add "type of services to be provided" to the "number of children from low-income families" as a dual basis for in-district allocations. Also drop the eighty percent provision to ensure that such flexibility can be exercised.

TITLE I, Sec. 1114(a)(1)(B) - School-wide Projects (eligibility percent)

PROBLEM: The eligibility percent for school-wide projects is not equivalent operationally among secondary and elementary schools because of the underutilization of the school lunch program at the secondary level. Additionally, school-wide projects often require additional allocations of funds to be successful for all students. The proposed reduction to 50% poverty would double the number of eligible school-wide project schools and create a drain on static Title I funding.

RECOMMENDATION: Drop the eligibility threshold to 50% for secondary schools in school year 1996-97, while tying a reduction beyond 65% in the eligibility threshold for elementary schools (the bulk of the program) to a \$7.5 billion appropriation trigger for LEA Grants.

TITLE I, Sec. 1114(c) - School Support Teams

PROBLEM: School support teams are proposed as an ongoing resource for school-wide project schools, not a punitive improvement sanction. Therefore, the support teams should be developed jointly by the LEA along with the State, not independently by the State.

RECOMMENDATION: The school support team process should be developed "jointly with the LEA".

TITLE I, Sec. 1115(b)(2)(C) - Eligible Children in Targeted Asst. Schools (homeless)

PROBLEM: Since homeless children attend many schools across an LEA, the proposed requirement to provide services to such children, irrespective of the eligibility of the school which they attend, could result in providing program services in large numbers of ineligible schools—a major logistical and financial problem for the local program—and one that runs counter to the intent of the proposal to target schools better.

RECOMMENDATION: Add that funds received under Title I shall be used "to the extent practicable" to serve homeless children in non-eligible attendance areas.

TITLE I, Sec. 1115(c)(1)(E) - Use of Highly Qualified Staff

PROBLEM: What is a "highly" qualified staff member? Do they have to be more qualified than some subset of other staff members in order to serve in the Title I program?

RECOMMENDATION: Strike the word "highly", as well as strike any other gratuitous modifiers, which could be given legal significance at some point in the future. Alternatively, such terms could be defined to avoid putting school systems in legal jeopardy.

TITLE I, Sec. 1115(c)(2)(A)(i) - Targeted Assistance Schools (participation and assessment)

PROBLEM: Title I programs should be accountable for increased performance in those curricular areas where the program has directly intervened. Accountability for the performance of the entire

school in subjects where intervention has not occurred is somewhat more speculative, even if desirable.

RECOMMENDATION: Add to the selection provision a requirement to specify how such children's performance in the core subject areas in which program instruction is provided will be assessed and reported.

TITLE I, Sec. 1116(e)(2) - Building Capacity for Parental Involvement (literacy training)

PROBLEM: The proposed language requires the LEA to provide literacy training if not available elsewhere for parents. Again the LEA, as in the health screening requirement, appears to become the "payor of last resort" for a service beyond the education of Title I students. There just is not sufficient money for LEAs to pay for all these desirable things.

RECOMMENDATION: Add language which indicates "to the extent practicable."

TITLE I, Sec. 1117 - Nonpublic School Services

PROBLEM: The current language of the nonpublic school section has been litigated substantially over the years and has a widely understood interpretation. The proposed bill reorganizes and expands this time-tested language unnecessarily. Such a restructuring of the entire provision and the addition of the uniform requirements in the general provisions raises concern that somehow the nonpublic schools may become entitled to more than the triple-dipping (the off-the-top allotment, the regular allocation of educational services, and the services provided with the capital expense funds) which is allowable under current law.

RECOMMENDATION: Return to the current law language.

TITLE I, Sec. 1118 (c) - School Improvement

PROBLEM: The proposed provisions on school improvement would place virtually every school in the major cities in the program improvement category. The criteria of being in school improvement for two years under the predecessor statute would reach the vast majority of the city schools. The remaining schools almost certainly would fail to meet the "virtually all students meeting the State's 'advanced' performance standards" criteria. Establishing 'advanced performance' as the criteria for school improvement in Title I would so over-enroll the program improvement category as to make it meaningless (which appears to be happening even under the current law criteria). Literally tens of thousands of schools would not meet this overambitious criteria. The only workable criteria for school improvement contained in the proposed bill, which would not overwhelm the capacity of the program improvement support system, is a failure to make adequate progress toward those performance standards for two or so consecutive years

RECOMMENDATION: Eliminate the language tying school improvement to a school's status under the current statute or the advanced standards criteria, and rely more on failure to make adequate progress for two or so consecutive years toward those standards.

TITLE I, Sec. 1118 (c) & (d) - Corrective Action

PROBLEM: The corrective actions language proposed for the local school improvement process and for the state LEA improvement process could be viewed as authorizing actions which might otherwise be beyond the authority of that agency under state law, but for this provision in the Title I statute.

RECOMMENDATION: Add a new subsection to sec. 1118 which states that no corrective actions are authorized beyond that which is allowable under existing state law.

TITLE I, Sec. 1119 (c) - Comparability

PROBLEM: The proposed bill's method for measuring comparability by using instructional salaries overlooks the salary differential resulting from years of seniority and collective bargaining. Hence, a school with a young, fully-qualified, professional staff may fall outside comparability limits based on salary.

RECOMMENDATION: Return to the current law approach using instructional staff to pupil ratio, and if necessary using professional staff to pupil ratios rather than pure salaries.

TITLE I, Sec. 1123 (c) - Children to be Counted

PROBLEM: Variations and year to year changes in data used by the SEA can affect LEA allocations substantially. Federal allocations to the LEA level would eliminate these unpredictable variation in funding and allow for closer scrutiny and more precise targeting by the Committee.

RECOMMENDATION: Return to the current law language requiring local allocations when data is available, and add language requiring completion of the school mapping project.

TITLE I, Sec. 1124(e)(4) - Concentration Grants (10 percent reservation in ineligible counties)

PROBLEM: The proposed provision allows total state discretion within the ten percent reservation for allocation of such funds to eligible LEAs in ineligible counties. However, if there are a limited number of such LEAs in a state, the full reservation could over-reward LEAs in ineligible counties at the expense of eligible LEAs in eligible counties.

RECOMMENDATION: A limitation on the per pupil allocation for each counted child in the eligible LEAs of ineligible counties to an amount not to exceed the per pupil allocation for traditionally concentration-eligible LEAs in the State would resolve the problem.

OMISSIONS FROM TITLE I - Federal Administration (Negotiated Rulemaking)

PROBLEM: No input mechanism for the development of new federal regulations has been included in the proposed bill.

RECOMMENDATION: Require negotiated rulemaking as in the 1988 amendments. Though not particularly widely known, negotiated rulemaking in 1988 resolved a number of very technical issues.

OMISSIONS FROM TITLE I - Continuation of the Policy Manual

PROBLEM: The 1988 Amendments required the establishment of an overall Policy Manual as the source of written interpretations, examples, and decisions affecting the program. This written document has been extremely helpful to program administrators and should be continued.

RECOMMENDATION: Require the continuation of an up-to-date Policy Manual, especially with all of the changes expected in the 1993-94 Amendments.

OMISSIONS FROM TITLE I - State Rulemaking and Policy (prohibition on state interference in local instructional decisions)

PROBLEM: Limitations on LEA decision-making in program policies (current law sec. 1451(a)(2)), and review of related state regulations and policies by the Committee of Practitioners have been excluded from the proposed bill, although serving an important role during the past five years. With all the complaints about over-regulation, the city Title I programs have found the States and their add-on requirements to be the primary culprit in over-regulation. These provision have allowed some level of relief from such state over-regulation.

RECOMMENDATION: Return to the current law protections.

TITLE II, Sec. 2123 - Allocations (allotments to middle-man agencies)

PROBLEM: With the limited amount of appropriations available, allocations to agencies whose personnel are not the target of this program seem ill-placed. The twenty-odd percent of the funds allotted for state activities and cooperative IHE projects are better targeted to the LEA, whose employees are the appropriate target for the staff development.

RECOMMENDATION: Eliminate the allocations for state activities and IHE activities, in order to target more funds to the LEAs for provision of services.

TITLE II, Sec. 2124 (a) & (b) - Math/Science Minimum

PROBLEM: Since a major theme of the reauthorization is increased flexibility for appropriate educational decisions, the minimum requirement derived from the focus of the predecessor law seems at cross-purposes. LEAs should focus on their greatest staff development needs under Title II without federal preemption for one subject matter or another.

RECOMMENDATION: Elimination of the minimums for math/science programming.

TITLE II, Sec. 2128 - Local Cost Sharing

PROBLEM: The proposed requirement for local cost sharing creates an unnecessary burden on already tight local resources or other federal allotments. Additionally, it is curious that only LEA cost sharing is required, while no State or IHE cost sharing is required. This provision seems not particularly well conceived or consistent.

RECOMMENDATION: Drop the local cost sharing entirely.

TITLE II, Sec. 2203 - Technical Assistance Centers

PROBLEM: Major urban school systems have a series of unique problems and capabilities on a range of fronts. No provision for specific services to urban schools has been proposed. Current technical assistance mechanisms set up through federal law are notoriously unhelpful to urban schools.

RECOMMENDATION: Include a requirement to establish an urban technical assistance center.

TITLE III, PART A - Technology

PROBLEM: Urban schools are lagging far behind their neighboring school districts in the acquisition and use of technology for instruction. In fact, due to the age of many of the school buildings in the cities there is little capacity to even utilize technology once it is acquired without retrofitting the facility. The focus of the proposed Title III on research and development through competitive grants provides little hope of overcoming the technology gap in urban schools. The scope of the Title is too narrow when compared to the national need.

RECOMMENDATION: Create a formula grant program similar to NDEA III which will provide assistance to urban and other LEAs for the acquisition and utilization of technology.

TITLE III, PART D, Sec. 3407 - Charter Schools Program

PROBLEM: The proposed bill provides for the SEA to be an eligible applicant for a charter school grant. This provision runs counter to the national tradition of local control of education.

RECOMMENDATION: The eligible applicant for a charter school grant should be an LEA, in partnership with a developer or an SEA.

TITLE IV - Safe and Drug Free Schools

PROBLEM: The problem of school violence has grown to sufficient proportions to suggest the need for a separate federal program. Consolidating an anti-violence initiative with an anti-drug initiative, as occurs in the proposed bill, may shortchange each.

RECOMMENDATION: Create separate Parts A and B of Title IV with separate authorizations of appropriations for the drug initiative and for the violence initiative. Allow for LEAs to consolidate the programming of the two Parts where such consolidation would benefit each initiative. For example, a program focusing on proper decision-making or peer pressure avoidance might be a consolidated anti-drug and anti-violence program. However, the acquisition of metal detectors would not seem to mesh with anti-drug efforts, unless the LEA also purchased a drug-sniffing dog. Each program would stand on its own merits before the Appropriations Committee as independent items on the national agenda, which they deserve to be.

TITLE IV, Sec. 4104(a) and 4105(b) - Off-the-Top Funding of Non-School Entities

PROBLEM: The drug and violence problems found in the schools need to be addressed directly by the entity in charge of operating those schools. Funding is tight enough, noting the appropriation reduction in this program, to suggest that it should be targeted only to the LEA level where the problem resides. Reduced funding does not provide the luxury of giving every entity with interest in the problem a little piece of the money.

RECOMMENDATION: Eliminate the reservation of 20% of the funds for the Governors and eliminate the reservation of 5% for SEA activities. If these programs are felt to be essential for some reason, then establish those programs as separate authorizations of appropriations in the same manner as the program for IHEs (sec. 4003(2)).

TITLE IV, Sec. 4105(d)(2)(B)(ii) - Allocation of Greatest Need Funds

PROBLEM: There is no certainty as to the manner in which the Title IV 30% funds for greatest need will be allocated within each state, since under the proposed language the State retains complete discretion to establish the in-state formula. This discretion over allocations often leads to allotments which are outside of the expectations of the Committee.

RECOMMENDATION: The Committee should re-set the in-state formula based on Chapter 1, as in current law, so that the Committee's expectations and those of the LEAs in greatest need are secure in statute. If the factors in the proposed bill are to be used, then the "consider" and "such as" should be changed to "shall".

TITLE V, PART A, Sec. 5107 - Priorities in Magnet School Grants

PROBLEM: The proposed priorities entirely redirect the Magnet School Program. The language attempts to fix something that is not broken. The Magnet School Program does the job which it was designed to do in current law. Only the "recentness of plan" priority has become obsolete over the years, since nearly all desegregation plans are a generation old at present. Aside from the recentness priority, the priorities in current law serve the program well. Much of the proposed language on magnet schools would not only redirect funding in unpredictable ways but appears to be puzzling in its origin and intent. Finally, the proposed priority for selection by lottery is certainly questionable. While some magnet programs do use lotteries for selection, other methods of student selection should not be excluded. The competitive nature of the magnet school application process means that no proposals outside of the priority areas can expect to secure sufficient review points in order to be funded. The proposed shift in priorities appears to be detrimental to this successful program.

RECOMMENDATION: Return to the priorities in current law, absent the recentness criteria.

TITLE V, PART A, Sec. 5108(a)(3) - Use of Funds in Magnet Schools

PROBLEM: The proposed language continues the confusion over what kind of staff can be funded with a magnet schools grant. It seems unnecessary and unwise to place this type of limit in the use provision, potentially preventing the use of personnel such as health care professionals, paraprofessionals and technicians, retired businessmen, persons with expertise in the arts, and others.

RECOMMENDATION: Change licensed and certified elementary and secondary school teachers to "qualified staff".

TITLE V, PART A, Sec. 5109 (c) and (d) - Grant Award Limits in Magnet Schools

PROBLEM: The proposed bill reduces the maximum grant award over the course of a grant cycle by half and creates a significant local match. Both provisions create financial burdens on the potential grantees, and again attempt to fix something that is not broken. If the trade off for longer-term grant support (4 year grants) is smaller grant awards and local cost sharing, then the current law (2 year - 100% grants) is preferable.

RECOMMENDATION: Eliminate the cost sharing provision and retain the \$4 million per year maximum grant size. In addition, we recommend putting stiffer requirements into the law which will prevent the continuing untimely nature by which grant awards are made and announced.

TITLE VII - Bilingual Education

RECOMMENDATION: Replace the Administration's proposed revisions to the Bilingual Education Act with revisions to Title VII contained in H.R. 3229, developed by the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Part F--Special Rule

PROBLEM: The legislation includes a new part F which states that no current grant recipient shall be eligible for fourth-and fifth-year renewal awards provided under current law.

RECOMMENDATION: Eliminate Sec. 7601.

Sec. 7003. Definitions (A)(4)--IMMIGRANT STUDENTS

PROBLEM: Sec. (A)(4) of the bill redefines "immigrant students" as individuals "aged three through twenty-one who have not been attending one or more schools in any one or more States for more than 12 months." This contrasts with the current requirement that immigrant students include students not born in the country and who have been attending schools in one or more States for less than three complete academic years. Also, the proposed competitive grant program could ostensibly disqualify eligible first year immigrants because, by the time the Department of Education made the grant and the LEA program was implemented, the eligible immigrant identified in the application would no longer be deemed an "immigrant".

RECOMMENDATION: Use current legislation in section (A)(4) which requires that immigrant students include all students not born in the country and who have been attending schools in one or more States for less than three complete academic years.

Part D-- Emergency Immigrant Education Program

Sec. 7402. (b)(1)(2)Eligible Local Educational Agency.

PROBLEM: The language proposed increasing the minimum number of immigrant students who must be enrolled in order for an LEA to qualify for a grant from a minimum of 500 students or three

percent of total student enrollment to 1000 students or ten percent of total school enrollment.

RECOMMENDATION: Use current law thresholds for the LEAs, and retain current law for the distribution of funds by counts of eligible children rather than discretionary grants.

TITLE VIII, Sec. 8003(a) - Eligible Children for Impact Aid Program

PROBLEM: The proposed bill eliminates the payments for low rent public housing children. These children create as much or more of a financial burden on LEA as any other category of Impact Aid eligible child. The families of these children produce virtually no revenue for the operation of the school system (no property tax revenue, little income tax revenue, little sales tax revenue). Additionally, such children generally are clustered in large numbers due to housing project locations over which the school system has little control, thereby producing even greater burdens on the schools.

RECOMMENDATION: Restore the eligibility of LRH children in the proposed bill in accordance with their true financial burden on a school district.

TITLE VIII, Sec. 8003(b)(2)(B) and (C) - Payment Rate in Impact Aid

PROBLEM: The proposed bill establishes a payment rate in Impact Aid based on a proportion of state aid. This approach does not reflect the burden of educating federally-connected children on a local school district. Under this concept it would be more appropriate to pay at a rate related to the LEA local contribution per pupil rather than some statewide average of state aid contribution, an apples and oranges comparison at best.

RECOMMENDATION: Retain current law payment rate or go to a true "local " contribution rate, rather than a state average proxy.

TITLE IX, PART B, Sec. 9203(a) - General Provisions (local administrative fund consolidation)

PROBLEM: The proposed language allows LEAs to consolidate administrative funds, but provides the SEA with the authority to determine the percentage of funds to be consolidated. If there is no such consolidation ESEA, not the State, controls the percentage of local administrative funds in the same way as ESEA controls SEA administrative funds by specific provision. Under the consolidation the same statutory limits and flexibilities should apply pursuant to the specific ESEA provisions without SEA intervention.

RECOMMENDATION: The only local limitation on administrative consolidations should be "not more than the percentage established in each ESEA program".

TITLE IX, PART D, Sec. 9401 (c) - Waivers

PROBLEM: Nearly every example of a waiver of statutory requirements seems to translate into an effort to use targeted federal funds on a larger universe involving ineligible children. These type of waivers do not attack administrative barriers as much as they attack the integrity of the legislative purpose of the initiative. Streamlining and deregulation are positive reforms, while redirecting funding away from the legislative target group is counterproductive.

RECOMMENDATION: Add to the waiver prohibitions "eligible children."

TITLE IX, PART F, Sec. 9601 (a)(3)--1% Off-the-Top Reservation for State Recognition

PROBLEM: The proposed bill creates a program for recognition of exemplary performance by allowing States to take money off-the-top of a number of LEA formula grants and redistribute it to other school districts. If the recognition program is a legitimate national need, it should stand on its

own merits with a separate authorization of appropriation or alternatively could be funded out of the SEAs' administrative and other state set-asides rather than out of local programs funds.

RECOMMENDATION: Eliminate this off-the-top recognition program, which is more fluff than substance.

TITLE II OF THE 94 AMENDMENTS, PART B, Sec. 224 - GEPA Repeals

PROBLEM: The repeal of sec. 406A which would remove the requirement that the State furnish information on their use and allocation of federal funds to the Secretary and to other entities in the state seems unwise. Congress should not allow states to operate without informational scrutiny by the Department and other local entities in that state. In addition, the repeal of sec. 407 would remove a conflict of interest provision from the Education Department relating to appointed officials. Removal would appear to allow holding dual offices in the Department and elsewhere, as well as running a side business which could have dealings with the Department.

RECOMMENDATION: These sections should not be repealed.

TITLE II OF THE 1994 AMENDMENTS, PART D, Sec. 246 -Repeal of Regulation Limitations

PROBLEM: The proposal to repeal sec. 431 of GEPA appears to be an attempt by the Department of Education to escape from having to provide Federal Register prior notice and comment on its regulations before they take effect. This provision is the only protection for the education community from precipitous action without notice by the Department, and equally is the only protection for Congress against similar precipitous action since the institution no longer has regulatory veto authority. The APA is not applicable here due to the exclusion of grant programs.

RECOMMENDATION: Retaining the current sec. 431 is extremely important to the proper functioning of ESEA and other federal programs under the Committee's authority.

TITLE II OF THE 1994 AMENDMENTS, PART D, Sec. 250 -Repeal of Appeal Rights Protecting Against State Violations of Federal Law

PROBLEM: The proposed repeal of sec. 425 of GEPA would remove the only administrative vehicle which substate entities have to remedy State violations of federal law, rules, etc. in the administration of formula grants. This protection, while not often used, is important to retain as a deterrent to arbitrary action.

RECOMMENDATION: Retain the current sec. 425.

TITLE II OF THE 1994 AMENDMENTS, PART F, Sec. 261 -Grantback Repeal

PROBLEM: The proposed repeal of sec. 459, the so-called grantback, injures the children who did not receive the benefits of the program due to misexpenditures by a grantee and now would not receive the benefits of the grantback funds, as well. The grantee has already been punished by having to repay the misexpended funds with its own resources. The only entity not made whole in the audit recovery process is the intended beneficiary of the program. The grantback procedure attempts to remedy this problem by requiring the reprogramming of grantback funds to the intended beneficiaries of the original funding.

RECOMMENDATION: Retain the grantback provision in order to prevent the intended beneficiaries from being the ultimate loser in the audit recovery process.

TITLE III OF THE 94 AMENDMENTS, PART A, Sec. 311(d) -PL 89-313 Amendments

PROBLEM: The phase-in of PL 89-313 into IDEA protects the States financially for a period of

years, and protects the programs run by state agencies. However, the proposed language guarantees no phase-in or protection for local programs or children previously transferred from state agencies to LEAs, who historically have been eligible for PL 89-313 funding. Given the progress of deinstitutionalization over the years, this gap in local program protection could hurt tens of thousands of transferred children, many of whom have severe disabilities.

RECOMMENDATION: In amending sec. 611(d)(2)(A)(ii) of IDEA the "may" should become "shall" in order to ensure a phase-in of PL 89-313 into IDEA at the local program level as well

TITLE III OF THE 1994 AMENDMENTS, PART A, Sec. 311(a) -IDEA Formula Revisions

PROBLEM: The IDEA formula, both the current excess cost model and the proposed proportion of per pupil expenditure model, fails to take into account the additional financial burden placed upon LEAs with huge numbers of children with disabilities. Similar to the concept of increased burden in Title I concentration grants, LEAs with tens of thousands of disabled children similarly have increased burdens, which should be factored into the IDEA formula.

RECOMMENDATION: A concentration factor allocating 20% of the programs funds should be included in IDEA for LEAs enrolling more than 5000 disabled children

*All section references are to the September 10 Draft Bill.

Mr. TOWNS. Doctor Slavin.

Mr. SLAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to have an opportunity to talk with you today about one aspect of what you are considering here, which is professional development and how it relates to chapter 1 or should relate to chapter 1.

You have a copy of my written testimony, of course, and so I just wanted to touch on a few of the points that I was raising there.

Mr. TOWNS. Let me just say the entire written statements will be included in the record for all of you.

Mr. SLAVIN. Great.

Let me start by taking you on a mental journey. Imagine that at this moment we could all get up and be magically transported to some randomly selected urban chapter 1 school, and we came in unannounced and asked the principal to show us what their school was doing with its chapter 1 funds.

Chances are what we'd see is a teacher down the hall working with 6 to 10 students doing remedial instruction with limited connection to what's going on in the regular classroom, or we'd see aides helping students with seat work, or if the school were fortunate enough to be a school-wide project it might have smaller classes by a little bit, or might be using pull-outs and aides just like a nonschoolwide school.

The problem is that all those things that I just described, which overwhelmingly describe what's going on in chapter 1 schools, are things that research has failed to support time and time again, that as a result the overall effects of chapter 1 services, though positive, are much smaller than what we should be able to achieve for this amount of funding.

Now, contrast what is done in chapter 1 schools most typically with what we know to be effective. Among the programs that we know to be effective would be well-structured pre-school and kindergarten programs, one-to-one tutoring in reading for at-risk first graders, cooperative learning programs, continuous progress programs, peer tutoring, improved classroom management, reciprocal teaching in reading, cognitively guided instruction in mathematics, writing process models for teaching writing, and our own success for all program, which combines many of those elements.

Now, these kinds of approaches, and I could name many more, have several things in common. First off, they are supported by top quality research. They've been compared to control groups many times. Nobody denies the effectiveness of these kinds of approaches.

Another is that they are preventive, rather than remedial. They make sure that students are successful the first time they are taught, instead of falling behind and then getting remedial services.

Most importantly, these programs are all ones that require extensive professional development. They are not something that you can mandate from Washington, not something that you can put in a box and send somewhere. They all require training, follow-up, networking among teachers within the school and with teachers elsewhere. It's not something you can read from Eric, these are things that require serious professional development to implement

properly, and that's why so few of them are used on any systematic basis in chapter 1 programs.

If we are going to make chapter 1 effective, this has got to change. We have to change what teachers are doing on a day-to-day basis with students in schools. We need a change to see that they are working to make sure that learning problems are prevented, rather than occurring and then being remediated.

The Chapter 1 Commission that was chaired by David Hornbeck has proposed one way of getting at this state of affairs, where teachers in chapter 1 schools would be using more effective programs, proposing a set-aside of chapter 1 funds that would gradually increase over time, that would be targeted for use in staff development in high poverty schools.

The focus of these funds would be on programs that have a proven track record of success in well-controlled research. Schools would not be limited in advance to a certain set of programs, but there would be a tight connection between research and development on the one hand providing new models of how to use chapter 1 dollars, and response in the schools to adopt those programs with adequate professional development.

We proposed that this money be controlled by the schools, and that the schools have the ability to use those dollars with any provider of training or follow-up services that they would select. We feel that if accountability is on the school that they must have the authority to use chapter 1 dollars as they see fit to meet their own needs. They then could use these dollars in federally established technical centers, universities, or they could use them with private providers. They have to be able to choose who works with them if staff development is going to be effective.

The administration's proposal, in consolidating many technical assistance agencies, is a small step in the right direction, but it's not enough. Those agencies, if they are serving one-tenth of the country, would still be serving areas with the population of Australia plus New Zealand, they still would not be close enough to local needs. If a school happened to be in an area where their local technical assistance agency was incompetent, was too busy, was too far away, or whatever, then the school is out of luck. I think it's critical that we concentrate the dollars—that we apply the dollars at the school level to be used as the schools see fit, so that they can accomplish the improvements under a tough accountability system that they are trying to accomplish, but with flexibility to get the kind of help that they need.

My time is up, but I just want to mention briefly that an aggressive plan for increasing the amount of professional development must also include money for additional research and development. We know a great deal about how to improve chapter 1 schools. There's a great deal more we need to know, and if we are offering to schools opportunities to use chapter 1 dollars to adopt effective programs we need a much longer list of effective programs.

The allocations that exist in the current structure for R&D are no where near enough to provide us in a quick form the kinds of programs and practices we need to improve instruction in the large number of Chapter 1 schools.

I'll leave off there.

Mr. TOWNS. Thank you very much, Doctor Slavin.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Slavin follows:]

The election of Bill Clinton has created unprecedented opportunities for reform in American education, particularly reform in the education of disadvantaged students. It comes at a time when change in education has been taking place at an accelerating rate. With a pragmatic President deeply committed to the education of all students and a Department of Education politically aligned both with the Congress and with the White House, many of the barriers to major change have been removed.

At this time of political change it is a highly significant coincidence that the Elementary and Secondary Act is currently before the Congress for reauthorization, and that Chapter 1 of the ESEA, by far the largest Federal program in elementary and secondary education, has received unprecedented attention from reformers. Support for Chapter 1 has long been strong at the political level, and it remains strong today, yet never has there been such a consensus among educators and policy makers that Chapter 1 is in need of fundamental change.

The stage is set, then, for major change in the education of disadvantaged students. It is certain that legislative and regulatory changes will in fact take place. But will these legislative and regulatory changes actually make a difference in the school success of disadvantaged children? In many ways, hoping to positively affect what takes place between teachers and students in classrooms across the U.S. by passing legislation in Washington is like trying to do watch repair with a ten foot pair of tweezers. The connection between policy and practice is clear enough in theory, but enormously complex in reality. This would be true if the U.S. were a small nation with a single governmental agency responsible for all aspects of education, but it is obviously much more true in the actual situation where the federal role is relatively circumscribed and many agencies with competing agendas at the federal, state, county, and local levels are all trying to influence what happens in schools. How can decisions made in Washington affect what Ms. Grundy does with her third grade class in Muleshoe, Texas?

Systemic Reform

The watchword of the current reform movement is “systemic reform.” This term is defined in quite different ways by different advocates, but the defining attribute of systemic reform is a focus on changing the environment within which schools operate rather than trying to change schools one at a time or to introduce specific programs to help schools in only one aspect. The rhetorical opposite of systemic reform is piecemeal reform. A hallmark of systemic reform is a focus on standards, assessments, accountability, rewards and sanctions based on student performance, curriculum frameworks, and regulatory reform to increase flexibility at the school site to use resources to meet students’ needs.

Accountability-related reforms are certainly needed, if only to put an end to counterproductive accountability systems based on norm-referenced standardized tests that now inhibit many potential improvements (see, for example, Slavin & Madden, 1991; Koretz, Linn, Dunbar, & Shepard, 1992). They can shift teachers toward use of improved curricula. However, they are not enough in themselves to bring about major changes in the nature and quality of classroom instruction. Accountability pressures, frameworks, textbook adoption regulations, and other systemic reforms may encourage Ms. Grundy to teach more creative writing or sex education or multicultural education, but they are unlikely to help her do a better job of teaching subjects she’s always taught (such as reading and math).

In order to fundamentally change Ms. Grundy’s day-to-day classroom practices, much more than accountability and frameworks are needed. What is needed is a strategy for professional development, to identify effective teaching methods and materials, make Ms. Grundy and her colleagues aware of them, provide them with effective training, support, and followup as well as the time needed to help each other implement new methods to a high degree of quality, and to make continuing professional development a focus of Ms. Grundy’s school forever, not just for a brief moment when one-time funding is available or when a burst of energy somehow appears among a school’s staff.

Professional development is the essential link between federal and state goal setting, accountability, and curricular frameworks and the realities of classroom practice. If teachers and administrators confront higher standards without improved resources and tools to meet those standards, the result is cynicism and subversion. Their natural response is to attempt to undermine or belittle the standards, to blame others for their inability to meet the standards, to find ways around the standards (for example, by assigning more students to special education; see Allington & McGill-Franzen, 1992), or to cheat (see Hawley, 1992). If higher standards and systemic reform are to lead to concrete and lasting improvement in teachers' classroom practices, top-quality professional development must be a first priority.

Professional Development and Chapter 1

Historically, the federal role in professional development has been small in dollar terms, although often influential. The National Diffusion Network (NDN) has disseminated information on some types of programs and helped put schools in touch with training resources. Chapter 2 funds are often used for staff development, and the Eisenhower program provides staff development in math and science. Yet today there is an unprecedented opportunity to substantially increase federal support for professional development, at least for schools serving disadvantaged students. This is the reauthorization of Chapter 1 currently before Congress. For the first time, there is growing support for the idea of transforming Chapter 1 from a program primarily providing supplementary services to individual children to a means of motivating and supporting schoolwide change. This shift in focus began with the 1988 reauthorization, which expanded the opportunity for high-poverty schools to implement schoolwide projects and changed accountability provisions to focus more on student outcomes. Proposals being put forward for the current reauthorization, however, would go much further in making improvement of the school as a whole a major focus of Chapter 1. In particular, the Commission on Chapter 1, chaired by David Hornbeck, has proposed a gradually increasing set-aside of Chapter 1 funds for professional development, ultimately reaching 20%. Additional funds were envisioned to build

professional development capacity in the states and to pay for enhanced R & D programs for Chapter 1 schools. The Independent Review Panel of the National Assessment of Chapter 1, convened by the U.S. Department of Education and chaired by Phillis McClure, has made a similar set of proposals (U.S. Department of Education, 1993a). The potential impact of these proposals, if adopted, would be profound. At current funding levels, 20% of Chapter 1 is \$1.34 billion, probably more than is spent annually on professional development by all federal, state, intermediate, and local agencies combined.

Why should Chapter 1 resources be shifted to fund school change and professional development? How could a professional development structure established by Chapter 1 most effectively help schools serving disadvantaged students improve the instructional practices of their entire staffs? What part should educational research and development play in ensuring that professional development actually enhances student achievement? The remainder of this paper addresses these questions.

Why Should Chapter 1 Support Professional Development?

Chapter 1 is changing. As a result of changes introduced in the 1988 Hawkins-Stafford Amendment and other developments in research and practice, Chapter 1 programs are increasingly focusing on improving integration of Chapter 1 and regular classroom instruction and on improvements in curriculum and instruction. Schoolwide projects have increased rapidly, and program monitoring has shifted its focus more toward learning outcomes.

Despite these positive trends, Chapter 1 still affects only a small portion of students' school days (U.S. Department of Education, 1993b). Pullout is still the overwhelmingly most common structure for Chapter 1 services; for most Chapter 1 students, Chapter 1 means 20-40 minutes each day of remedial instruction in reading, math, or language. Except in schoolwide projects, Chapter 1 typically has little effect on instruction in the *regular* classes of Chapter 1 children. Under current regulations, Chapter 1 schools can spend up to 5% of their allocations on

staff development, which can include regular teachers. Yet most schools do not even spend this much.

The reason that Chapter 1 funds have little impact on the regular program is, of course, that the regulations are designed to force schools to spend their resources on individual test-eligible children, to keep Chapter 1 from becoming general school aid. Yet it is unrealistic to expect large effects on student achievement in 20-40 minutes per day. Chapter 1 could magnify its impact substantially if a portion of Chapter 1 funds could be devoted to improving the curriculum, instructional practices, classroom management skills, assessment practices, and other skills of the regular classroom teachers with whom Chapter 1 students spend most of their day, and to enable schools to engage in school wide improvements in organization, professional development, curriculum, and parent involvement.

Compared to direct service, professional development is very inexpensive. For the cost of one aide (roughly \$20,000 in salaries and benefits), an elementary school of 500 students with 20 teachers could spend \$1000 per teacher on professional development each year, enough for consultation, training, followup, materials, release time, and other services far beyond what most schools ever receive. For the cost of two aides or one teacher (\$40,000), professional development programs of exceptional quality could be implemented. It is impossible to argue that one teacher or two aides in a school of 500 students could have anything like the impact on at-risk students of a \$40,000 professional development program.

The Hornbeck Commission has proposed that Chapter 1 schools ultimately be required to spend at least 20% of their allocations on professional development. To avoid overloading the existing staff development capacities in each area, the Commission envisioned phasing in this requirement over a four-year period, with a 10% set-aside in 1994-95, 15% in 1996, and 20% in 1997 and beyond. Schools could spend more than this if they wished to do so. Schools would be permitted to bank up to one year's professional development funds to use in a future year, so that they could choose to concentrate their resources for a major professional development program in the future (and so that schools not ready for major professional development could have more

time to plan). A mechanism to assure that the set-aside would not supplant current staff development efforts would be a part of the plan.

The advantages of a 20% set-aside are many. As noted earlier, high-quality staff development programs would enable schools to improve instruction all day for all their students. Further, Chapter 1 schools would become centers of educational renewal and professional growth, and would therefore attract teachers who are interested in professional growth and innovation. Since Chapter 1 funding has been increasing and is likely to continue to do so, a phased-in 20% set-aside would probably not force schools to reduce direct services, only to devote more of new monies to professional development. Tying a specified percentage of Chapter 1 funds to professional development is preferable to asking Congress to allocate special funds for professional development; the experience of local school districts and state departments is that whenever times get tough, professional development is the first thing to be cut, and the same process would be likely at the national level. Schools (and staff development agencies) must have some confidence that professional development funds are “hardwired” into the funding stream if they are to engage in the long-term strategic planning that characterizes quality professional development.

Funding professional development is especially important now, as schools are beginning to make major shifts in curriculum and instruction to respond to the national goals and to new state assessments. Chapter 1 schools are often the last to make these changes; they should be the first.

There are three major arguments against a 20% set-aside, but these can be addressed. One is that most of these funds will inevitably serve students who are not eligible for Chapter 1 services. However, as long as accountability systems continue to focus on the gains made by Chapter 1 students (or low achievers in general), it does not matter if other children benefit. To withhold effective and cost-effective services from Chapter 1 students because their classmates might also benefit would be perverse. Also, many non-Chapter 1 students in Chapter 1 schools

are from poor families, and even if they are doing well enough to avoid Chapter 1 are often still not performing as well as they should.

It might be argued that schools should not be forced to use their Chapter 1 resources on professional development, that they should have the freedom to use these dollars for any purpose consistent with the overall goals of Chapter 1. The problem with this argument is that there are always political pressures within schools and districts to spend available funds on personnel rather than on improved practices. Up to eighty percent of Chapter 1 funds at the school level could still be used for personnel, but it is critical to protect a meaningful proportion of funds to be used to help a school's staff improve its programs and practices.

Another argument against the set-aside might be that there is no guarantee that the money would be spent on training that actually makes a difference. This is the most serious concern. The Hornbeck Commission has recommended addressing it by having Chapter 1 also invest in capacity building in SEA's and LEA's, and most importantly, in national research and development to identify effective programs and practices. The remainder of this paper discusses means of ensuring that professional development dollars actually make a difference in the educational success of children in Chapter 1 schools.

How Should Set-Aside Funds Be Used?

The funds set aside for professional development could be used for a broad range of purposes directly related to improving the education of at-risk students. This could include the following.

1. Consultation to help school staffs explore alternative courses of action to improve curriculum and instruction.

Research on schools implementing various programs has found that school staffs have rarely considered a range of alternatives before settling on a given option. Yet a process of

examining alternatives in light of the school's needs and resources would be valuable not only in producing a better match but also in increasing the school staff's commitment to a course of action they have carefully considered. To facilitate this process, schools might devote funds to hire consultants who are aware of a broad range of options that a school might consider and skilled in helping school staffs organize themselves to prepare for reform (e.g., forming committees to investigate various programs, services, and materials for potential adoption), clarify their philosophies, needs, and resources, and develop staff vision and cohesiveness. These consultants should be aware not only of a wide variety of programs and materials from which schools might choose, but also of the research done to evaluate each, and should be able to help school staffs select approaches that promote ethnic and gender equity. After a school staff has decided on a direction and is implementing its plan, the consultant might work with school staff to help them adapt innovations to their needs, a key step in adoption of externally developed models (Crandall, 1982; McLaughlin, 1990).

2. Training in specific models of instruction, school organization, parent involvement, family support, and so on.

When school staffs have decided how they want to proceed, they would decide to invest in training, followup, materials, release time for training and planning, and other costs. These could be costs of adopting specific innovations, such as Reading Recovery (Pinnell, 1989), general school organization plans, such as the School Development Program (Comer, 1988) or Success for All (Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan & Wasik, 1993; Slavin, Madden, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1992), or to help staff develop home-grown approaches to curriculum, instruction, or school organization. Schools might choose to ask the staff of effective schools in their area to help them implement new strategies.

Schools might be encouraged (but not required) to use programs that have been successfully evaluated in rigorous studies. Federal and state agencies might be asked to prepare and continually update guides to effective programs for use in the planning process.

3. Release time not only for participating in training, but also for common planning, peer coaching, and other means of ensuring high-quality implementation of new methods.

Time for professional development has always been scarce, yet research on effective staff development shows the need for extensive opportunities for teachers to engage in collaborative planning, peer coaching, and other activities. Professional development funds should be available to release teachers in schools implementing major changes to participate in such activities on a routine basis (Purnell & Hill, 1992; Showers, Joyce, & Bennett, 1987; Wilson, 1993).

4. Professional staff to work in the school to help teachers implement new methods.

One of the most important lessons of research on our Success for All program (Slavin et al., 1992) is the importance of having a full-time facilitator in each school to help teachers implement the many changes inherent in the program. Facilitators visit teachers' classes to give them feedback on their lessons; organize meetings among teachers for joint planning and problem solving; manage an internal assessment system to make sure that all students are making adequate progress; and ensure that all staff members working with the same children are in communication with each other. For comprehensive schoolwide innovations like Success for All, such facilitators are essential. For less ambitious innovations, district-level "circuit riders" who rotate among several schools using a given method or program can be effective. This is a

typical arrangement, for example, to support broad-scale use of cooperative learning within a district.

5. Materials and supplies to enable school staff to implement improved curricula and instruction.

Obviously, school staffs will need materials and supplies to help them implement improved practices. This could include student materials, teachers' manuals, videos, software, and other materials and supplies clearly beyond those (such as textbooks and paper) typically present in schools. However, some sort of limitation must be placed on the proportion of the 20% set-aside that could be used for this purpose. The danger is that schools might for example, define "computer assisted instruction" as the innovation they are implementing and then satisfy the 20% set-aside primarily by purchasing hardware and software. Schools may of course use other Chapter I funds to purchase computers or other expensive materials, but the 20% set-aside should be devoted primarily to professional development and relatively inexpensive materials to facilitate implementation.

School Control Over Staff Development Resources

Schools (not districts) are the organizations held responsible for student gains in the current Chapter I accountability system, and this responsibility is likely to remain in the future. Consequently, schools should largely control their professional development dollars. Ideally, school staffs should be able to choose from among effective programs, select trainers and materials, and so on. They should be encouraged to pool funds with other schools to, for example, bring in a trainer or workshop program that would be appropriate for multiple schools. In practice, it is likely that the LEA would take a major role in determining how schools spend their staff development resources, since the district does have ultimate authority over its schools.

However, Chapter 1 practices should strengthen the role of the individual school in deciding on its own needs.

State departments, LEA's, intermediate units, universities, lighthouse schools, and other organizations will all be expected to develop capacity to support innovation in Chapter 1 schools, but the schools should have the freedom to make their own selections of consultants, programs, and trainers. By creating a "free market" of professional development services, schools will avoid being saddled with ineffective or inappropriate services; good programs will grow, poor ones will fade, regardless of who sponsors them. Chapter 1 should help build professional development capacity in each state and region, but not compel schools to use any particular service.

Building Capacity to Support Innovation

Serious, long-term staff development is so rare in American education that existing capacity for supporting it is inadequate. At current levels, a 20% set-aside would mean \$1.34 billion, more than the current structure could absorb. Therefore, the Commission has proposed that Chapter 1 provide funds to SEA's to help them build capacity within their states to support innovation. This could mean establishing state or regional Chapter 1 Improvement Centers; working out ways to identify and certify school change experts who would work with schools to help them decide what changes they should be making and make them aware of training or materials to support innovation; identifying highly effective and innovative schools whose staff is willing to work with other schools; or contracting with universities or innovative LEA's to help with school change. However, as noted earlier, the fact that SEA's build capacity to support innovation in no way implies that schools must use their services.

Research and Development in Support of Chapter 1 Professional Development

In order to achieve the high standards stated in the national goals and emphasized in all of the commission reports, Chapter 1 schools will have to do a far better job of teaching all

students. Accountability provisions and rewards and sanctions may provide incentives for schools to do a better job, but they will not work unless schools have available methods and materials to enable them to do a better job. Change depends on teachers teaching *better*, not on teachers teaching *harder*. The staff development processes discussed above would will be helpful in moving Chapter 1 schools toward more effective practices, but by themselves they beg the critical question: What works? What instructional methods, curricular approaches, materials, staff development methods, school organization plans, and other alterable features of school and classroom practice make a difference in student achievement and other outcomes? Without a set of replicable, effective instructional, curricular, and organizational strategies that Chapter 1 schools may choose or adapt, it is unlikely that responsible and effective innovation will take place.

Our current knowledge base relating to effective practice is totally inadequate. There is good research on some elements of effective practice, but it is swamped by false claims and slick marketing. Lacking the training to critically evaluate research findings and lacking the time and resources to sift through the research in any case, most educators give up on trying to figure out what really works and instead rely on what's "in." The result is rampant faddism, with educators rushing from one untested miracle to another.

The federal involvement in R & D on effective programs has been minimal. Chapter 1/Title I has spent millions on evaluation but \$0.00 to support development, assessment, and diffusion of programs and practices designed to enhance student achievement. The Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) rarely funds program development. One indication of this is that although a substantial fraction of OERI R & D money goes to labs and centers, the National Diffusion Network list of effective programs contains only a handful of programs (out of more than 500) developed by labs or centers. The NDN is supposed to certify and then help disseminate effective programs, but its evaluation requirements are minimal and its funding to help disseminate its programs has been tiny (see Klein, 1992). Ideally, Chapter 1 professional development dollars should be restricted to programs that have been shown in

rigorous research to be effective, but at present such a restriction would force schools to choose from among a very small set of programs (see Slavin, Karweit, & Madden, 1989).

What Chapter 1 needs is a large number of programs and practices that have been well developed, well researched, and found to be effective, and are then readily available to Chapter 1 schools. Work to this end must proceed on several fronts. The Hornbeck Commission has proposed a set-aside of one percent of Chapter 1 dollars to be used for development, evaluation, and dissemination of effective programs and practices for use in Chapter 1 schools*. First, Chapter 1 should fund research on effective practices, including development and evaluation of specific programs and materials, staff development and school organization methods, and so on. The products of this R & D process would be both particular programs (e.g., reading programs like Reading Recovery, school organization plans like Levin's or Comer's models), as well as variables relating to effective practice (e.g., information on how to integrate classroom and supportive services, how to organize peer coaching to support adoption of an innovation, how to incorporate multicultural perspectives in curriculum and instruction, how to use discovery in mathematics or reciprocal teaching in reading). Since educators usually modify and adapt new methods, research suggesting the kinds of adaptations that might improve or disable innovations would be important.

Second, Chapter 1 should fund third-party evaluations of promising programs and practices. This is one of the most important elements of the overall R & D plan, and is totally lacking today. Third-party evaluations would negotiate measures, designs, and procedures with developers and researchers, and would then conduct top-quality evaluations, comparing the achievement of students who experienced a given program or practice to similar students in run-of-the-mill Chapter 1 models. Developers would know the objectives to be assessed but not the items. Programs and practices chosen to be evaluated would be ones whose developers had already done their own successful evaluations. The outcome of these third-party evaluations

* This is one percent over and above the funds now used (primarily by Policy and Evaluation Services) to assess the overall effectiveness and nature of Chapter 1 programs. The set-aside is for research on programs and practices for use in Chapter 1 programs, not general program evaluations.

would be a set of programs and practices capable of significantly enhancing student achievement (if properly implemented). Most importantly, adopters could have faith in the evaluations and, therefore, in the programs. This would help them feel better able to invest in high-quality staff development, followup, and maintenance needed to implement the programs and continue them over time. The third-party evaluations would give education something like the FDA, which is essential in giving physicians and patients confidence in medications and medical procedures. Until we have third-party evaluations we can trust, we have fads. It's as simple as that.

Certifying better mousetraps in no way guarantees their use. Developers and researchers will need funding to take their ideas from the pilot stage to disseminable form. This means funding for video tapes, awareness and training manuals, building of regional training sites, establishment of "lighthouse" model schools for use in a comprehensive training plan, and so on. Research and development activities should be funded in such a way that if developers of effective approaches choose not to disseminate them, the funding agency could contract with someone else to do so. Effective programs must get off the shelf and into the classroom, whatever this takes.

The next requirement is a system to make Chapter 1 schools aware of the range of proven and promising programs that they might consider. The NDN awareness conferences provide a model for this, but as Chapter 1 takes on a more active role in staff development state and local agencies may need to take on similar functions.

Chapter 1 should help support the building of the R & D infrastructure. It should fund predoctoral and postdoctoral fellowships for talented young researchers to get into R & D relating to the needs of Chapter 1 schools. The need to attract the best minority students into this area of research is especially great. At present, very few talented students choose educational research as a profession, and fewer still choose applied research in schools serving disadvantaged students. This must change if R & D is to become a key focus of Chapter 1.

Finally, it is essential that the word gets out about effective programs and practices for Chapter 1 schools. Part of the overall R & D plan should be commissioning of summaries of

research on effective practices, reports on important findings, and so on. The Department of Education might fund a research journal and a practitioner oriented newsletter to communicate new developments in Chapter 1. Reports may also be written for parents and community members.

The net effect of the R & D proposed by the Hornbeck Commission would be revolutionary but essential. If Chapter 1 is to demand the use of the best practices with Chapter 1 students, someone must know what best practices are. Given the history of R & D, there is little chance that this information will be forthcoming from anywhere else. For one percent of Chapter 1 funds, Chapter 1 can build toward a time when school staffs will be able to choose from among an array of programs and practices known to be capable of achieving the high levels of performance we all have agreed to be necessary, and will know how to implement and adapt them to meet their students' needs. It can help move educational innovation from faddism to science, and it can help build the infrastructure of educational R & D.

Conclusion

The opportunities for systemic reform in American education have never been as great as they are today. Yet, if systemic reform is to result in classroom change, it must emphasize professional development and R & D. Changing standards, assessments, curriculum frameworks, and regulations will create a climate conducive to positive change, but fundamental change in classroom practices will be built teacher by teacher, school by school. Ms. Grundy in Muleshoe will not change how she teaches reading or math because of edicts from Washington or Austin; she and her colleagues will do so only when they are encouraged and expected to choose from among effective programs and given the resources and time needed to learn new methods and adapt them to their own needs and resources. This paper describes how federal policies could help bring about this state of affairs.

References

- Allington, R.L., & McGill-Franzen, A. (1992). Does high-stakes testing improve school effectiveness? *ERS Spectrum*, 10(2), 3-12.
- Comer, J. (1988). Educating poor minority children. *Scientific American*, 259, 42-48.
- Commission on Chapter 1 (1992). *Making schools work for children in poverty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Crandall, D.P. et al (1982). *People, policies, and practices: Examining the chain of school improvement*. Andover, MA; The Network.
- Hawley, W.D. (1992). *Using Chapter 1 to fundamentally revision schools and learning*. Unpublished manuscript, Vanderbilt University.
- Klein, S.S. (1992). A framework for redesigning an R & D - based national education dissemination system in the United States. *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization*, 13(3), 256-286.
- Levin, H. (1987). Accelerated schools for disadvantaged students. *Educational Leadership*, 44(6), 19-21.
- McLaughlin, M.W. (1990). The Rand change agent study revisited: Macro perspectives and micro realities. *Educational Researcher*, 19(9), 11-16.
- Pumell, S., & Hill, P (1992). *Time for reform*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Showers, B., Joyce, B., & Bennett, B. (1987). Synthesis of research on staff development: A framework for future study and a state-of-the-art analysis. *Educational Leadership*, 45(3), 77-87.
- Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., & Madden, N.A. (1989) (Eds.). *Effective programs for students at risk*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (1991). Modifying Chapter 1 program improvement guidelines to reward appropriate practices. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 13, 369-379.

- Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B.A. (1992). *Success for All: A Relentless approach to prevention and early intervention in elementary schools*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- U.S. Department of Education (1993a). *Statement of the Independent Review Panel of the National Assessment of Chapter 1*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education (1993b). *Reinventing Chapter 1: The current Chapter 1 program and new direction*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Wilson, K.G. (1993). A national plan for overall educational reform. Columbus: Ohio State University, Project Discovery.

Mr. TOWNS. Let me just confer with my colleague here. We have a vote on. Do you think that—

Mr. MICA. I think we could probably hear Doctor Haycock.

Mr. TOWNS. OK, and then go vote after that.

Mr. MICA. And then come right back for questions.

Mr. TOWNS. OK.

Doctor Haycock, you are under a lot of pressure.

Ms. HAYCOCK. I'll move fast. All right.

Mr. Towns, Mr. Mica, I'm Kati Haycock. I'm the director of the education trust of the American Association for Higher Ed, but here today representing the Commission on Chapter 1, which was an independent group of 28 folks from around the country who spent the last 2½ years taking a careful look at the chapter 1 program with an eye toward figuring out how it could be improved to make it a more effective vehicle for improving achievement among poor kids.

Mr. Chairman, when you opened this hearing this morning, you spoke knowledgeably and compellingly about the needs of urban children in schools. As you very obviously know, basically what we do in this country is this: we take kids who have less to begin with, and then proceed to give them less in school. They get less in the way of experienced and well-trained teachers. They get less in the way of enriched curriculum, less in the way of well-equipped and well-stocked labs and libraries, and they get less of what makes the biggest difference of all, and that is an expectation that they can really achieve.

And, basically, we get from these kids precisely what we expect: very little. At every level of the educational system they score less well on any test of achievement. By the time poor and minority kids in this country are 17, they've got skills in English and math and science about the same as other 13 year olds, not because they were born brain damaged, but because, by and large, we fail to educate them in the same way we educate other kids.

Despite that general pattern, it is very clear in a number of schools around this country that these kids can learn at the same high levels as other kids if they are taught at high levels and provided the support that they need to achieve at that level. It's that philosophy, the philosophy not only that all kids can learn, but that all kids must learn, that undergirds what the administration is trying to do in its proposal. The idea is that we should have standards in this country that apply to all kids, that we ought to assess carefully whether kids make progress to those standards or not, that we ought to give building level educators some flexibility in deciding how to get kids there, but we have to hold them accountable for results.

Those steps are important steps to take, not just in urban schools, but across this country. Unfortunately, the Administration has not taken all of the steps, in our view at least, that it needs to take to bring about real change in urban schools, most importantly because it has failed to realize, as have many policy folks in this country, that standards and assessments don't educate kids, teachers do, and many teachers in this country do not themselves meet the standards we are articulating for 17-year-old students, much less know how to get kids there.

It's also failed to take into account that laws and regulations don't manage schools, principles do, and unless we invest aggressively in helping those professionals to deepen their knowledge and skills, we are not going to get kids to high levels of achievement.

Now, the administration has proposed to respond to the need for professional development by requiring states to include professional development in their chapter 1 plans, and by requiring states or LEA's and individual schools to include professional development plans in their own chapter 1 plans.

Interestingly, though, the administration has not proposed to fund this professional development through chapter 1, but instead through a new combination of chapter 2 and the old Eisenhower program. By contrast, as Bob mentioned, the Chapter 1 Commission recommended a direct set-aside within chapter 1 that would grow from 10 percent in the first year, to about 20 percent in the out years.

From the standpoint of urban school districts, a chapter 1 strategy is much more powerful. First, it's a larger investment. A set-aside within chapter 1 would put about three times as many dollars into professional and school development then would the proposed chapter 2 Eisenhower strategy.

Second, and of critical importance is an investment that's proportionate to its need. A chapter 1 set-aside strategy automatically drives more dollars to schools that have greater need and districts that have greater need. By contrast, the chapter 2 proposal doesn't guarantee that even the schools with the greatest need, the highest concentrations of poor kids, will get any help at all.

Finally, a chapter 1 strategy puts choice and decision making about professional development in exactly the right hands. What the commission proposed is that Government say squarely to teachers and administrators: we hold you accountable for getting larger numbers of your children, including your poor children, to high standards, but you get decision making about how you get there, and you get to control the money that you get for professional development. The administration's proposal, by contrast, doesn't put the decision making squarely in the hands of those that are held accountable for getting results. We don't think that makes sense.

We would strongly urge you in your subcommittee to recommend to the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Ed a chapter 1 set-aside. We've provided you with some suggested language to that effect.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Haycock follows:]

Commission on Chapter 1

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY
 COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
 SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS
 HEARING ON H.R. 3130: IMPLICATIONS FOR URBAN DISTRICTS

Kati Haycock
 American Association for Higher Education
 Commission on Chapter 1
 Tuesday, October 19

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, my name is Kati Haycock. I serve as Director of the Education Trust at the American Association for Higher Education, but am here this morning representing the Commission on Chapter 1. As some of you know, this independent, 28-member Commission was established three years ago to study the federal Chapter 1 program and make recommendations on how to improve its effectiveness in increasing academic achievement among poor and minority students. I have brought along with me today copies of our report, Making Schools Work for Children in Poverty; it calls for a complete overhaul of Chapter 1.

As most of you know, many schools serving poor children--especially those in inner cities--are in terrible trouble. Though they serve students with the most challenging needs, they typically do so with less than other school districts. On average, these schools have:

- o less in the way of experienced and well-educated teachers;
- o less in the way of a rich and well-balanced curriculum;
- o less well-equipped and well-stocked laboratories and libraries; and,
- o lower expectations for student performance.

Unfortunately, states and the federal government have often compounded these problems by creating add-on categorical programs aimed at providing extra assistance to special populations of students. While well-intended, these government initiatives have had several unintended side effects: they have fragmented the education for students who most need coherence, they have caused development of large bureaucracies to account for the expenditure of government dollars, and they have robbed regular educators of a sense of responsibility for the achievement of poor and minority children. More important, the preoccupation with administering the details of these programs has often distracted urban educators from getting about the business of improving core teaching and learning.

c/o American Association for Higher Education
 One Dupont Circle, Suite 360
 Washington, DC 20036-1110
 Ph: 202/293-6440 Fax: 202/293-0073

From our point of view, the Administration's proposal for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 includes many recommendations that, if implemented, will help to restore a focus on improving teaching and learning. Among the most important of these are:

- o the requirement that states set high standards for all children and develop better tools for assessing progress toward standards;
- o the increased concentration of dollars in schools where the need is greatest, and the elimination of "reverse incentives" in current law that take money away from schools that increase student achievement;
- o the requirement that holds schools accountable for getting increased numbers of their students to state standards and insists on corrective action for schools that do not make progress;
- o the elimination of the major obstacle in current law to serving limited English proficient students.

We are worried, however, that the Administration has stopped short of the complete overhaul of Chapter 1 that we believe is essential if we are to truly change the way that schools do business. In our view, there are four critical deficiencies in the proposal; I've been asked to talk with you this morning about one of them: the absence of guaranteed funding for professional and organizational development in schools serving poor children.

The Administration's proposal requires that state Chapter 1 plans include descriptions of "school support teams", technical assistance, and other steps that the state will take to help local schools and districts to improve. The proposal further requires that district and school Chapter 1 plans include "a coherent strategy for intensive and sustained professional development for teachers, administrators, and other staff...".

Interestingly, however, the Administration is not proposing to fund these required professional development activities through Chapter 1--but, instead, through a revised Chapter 2, collapsed with the Eisenhower Math and Science program. By contrast, the Commission recommended a set-aside in Chapter 1, beginning at 5% and increasing in the out years to 20%.

From the standpoint of urban education reform, a Chapter 2 strategy is far less desirable than a set-aside within Chapter 1. This is so for several reasons:

- o A larger investment.. A Chapter 1 set-aside will drive three times as many dollars into school-level professional development as would a Chapter 2/Eisenhower strategy.

- o Investment proportionate to need. A Chapter 1 set-aside automatically drives the most dollars to the districts and schools with the greatest need--those overwhelmed by concentrations of poverty. The Administration's proposal doesn't guarantee that high concentration schools will get ANY help, much less guarantee them the most help.
- o Choice and Decision-making in the right hands. The Chapter 1 Commission's proposal puts decision-making about what professional development is needed squarely in the hands of teachers and administrators at the school level. We said, essentially, that if government is to hold you accountable for getting larger number of your students to state standards, then you should decide what kind of help you need and have control over your professional development dollars. In effect, the Administration is proposing to hold schools accountable for progress without giving them a clear say over these resources. We think this is a mistake.

We would urge the Subcommittee to recommend a Chapter 1 set-aside strategy to the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education. Suggested language detailing the goals of such a strategy, and the respective duties of states and schools, is attached to this testimony.

Thank you. I would be happy to answer questions.

Attachment

PART III
Statutory Framework and Commentary
HELP AND CAPACITY-BUILDING

HELP AND CAPACITY-BUILDING

Staff Development and School Improvement

(1) GOALS

The goals of staff development and school improvement programs and activities funded under this Act are:

- (a) to assure that the curriculum, assessment, instruction, support services and course placement practices at each participating school operate to enable all students to achieve at the high levels called for under this Act;
- (b) to build the capacity of the school as a whole to become self-critical, self-regulating, and continually focused on improving results;
- (c) to assure that individual professionals on the school team have the knowledge and skills to enable students to achieve at the high levels called for under this Act;
- (d) to connect professional staff in participating schools with developments in their professions and disciplines; and
- (e) to develop the capacity of school staff to work with parents so that parents may become full participants in their children's education, both at home and at school.

(2) DUTY TO PROVIDE STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

(a) Participating Schools

(i) Each participating school shall plan and undertake a program of staff development and school improvement activities, in accordance with its school achievement plan and the goals specified in subsection A (1).

(ii) *School Achievement Plan.* Prior to receiving any funds under this Act, and every two years thereafter, each participating school shall prepare and submit to the local educational agency a comprehensive student achievement plan. The school shall involve teachers, other professional staff, parents, and in the case of secondary schools, students, in identifying needs and in developing their school's plan. The plan shall include:

(A) an analysis of student achievement patterns at the school and an assessment of students' progress in meeting the standards required under Section II; and

(B) based on that analysis:

(1) steps the school will take over the course of the academic year to ensure that increasing proportions of students meet the standards;

(2) an identification of staff development and school improvement activities the school will undertake, or participate in, to develop the school's capacity to improve student performance and to involve parents in the education of

their children; and

(3) a budget and timeline for staff development and school improvement activities.

(C) The plan shall incorporate the parent involvement plan developed pursuant to subsection V B.

(D) Plans submitted before states have adopted new standards and assessment systems should be based on an analysis of available data on student achievement, on a review of content and performance standards generated by professional organizations and a comparison of instructional practice at the school with available research and professional standards of best practice.

(iii) *Assistance to Students.* Each participating school shall undertake measures to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering any of the standards during the course of the school year shall be provided with effective, timely additional assistance, which shall include:

(A) measures to ensure that students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis and with sufficient particularity to provide effective assistance;

(B) periodic training for teachers in how to identify such difficulties and to provide assistance to individual students; and

PART III
Statutory Framework and Commentary
HELP AND CAPACITY-BUILDING

(C) for any student who has not demonstrated proficiency in mastering the standards in Section II, a joint review at least annually by the student's teacher and parents, of the results of the student's assessment required by subsection VII B, at which time the teacher and parents shall also discuss: (1) what the school will do to help the student meet the standards, (2) what the parents can do to help the student improve his or her performance, and (3) additional assistance which may be available to the student at the school or elsewhere in the community; and

(D) measures to ensure that all parents, including those with limited literacy or limited English proficiency, have the necessary information and other assistance to participate fully in the review required by subsection C.

(b) Local Educational Agencies

(i) Prior to receiving any funds under this Act, and every two years thereafter, each participating local educational agency shall develop a program and budget to assist participating schools with staff development and school improvement activities required by subsection (2) (a). The local educational agency program shall be described in a districtwide plan and:

(A) shall be based on analyses of student achievement patterns for the local educa-

tional agency as a whole, and by school;

(B) shall include assistance to schools in analyzing their data, in preparing student achievement plans pursuant to subsection (2) (a) (ii), and in identifying professional development and school improvement needs and quality providers; and

(C) may also provide for coordination of professional preparation and development and parent education activities for schools with similar needs, and assistance to schools in evaluating the quality of services purchased with funds received under this Act.

In developing its program, the local educational agency shall consider the student achievement plans and budgets developed by each participating school pursuant to subsection (2) (a) (ii), and shall identify any additional programs for staff development and school improvement, including a budget, that the local educational agency may decide to undertake using Chapter 1 funds. The local educational agency shall involve teachers, other professional staff, and parent representatives in developing the systemwide plan.

(ii) Notwithstanding the requirements of subsection (2) (b) (i), each local educational agency shall submit its budget for programs funded under this Act to the State educational agency on an annual basis.

(iii) The local educational agency shall ensure that summary information about the plans

developed pursuant to subsections (2) (a) (ii) and (2) (b) (i) is widely disseminated to parents and school staff, and is available to the public.

(iv) *Evaluation.* Each local educational agency shall ensure that all programs and activities funded in whole or in part under this section are properly evaluated. Evaluations shall be conducted according to accepted professional standards and the results made widely available to parents, school staff, and the public.

(c) State Educational Agencies

(i) Each State educational agency shall design and carry out a strategy to ensure the availability of high-quality professional development and school improvement assistance to participating schools. In consultation with local educational agencies, teacher and parent representatives, paraprofessionals, and university and other providers of staff development services, the State educational agency shall:

(A) conduct an analysis of the sources of assistance, public and private, currently available to local educational agencies and schools for staff development and school improvement and of the adequacy of these sources in enabling local educational agencies and schools to help children meet the standards required by Section II of this Act;

(B) develop initiatives to increase the kind and quality of resources available for staff development and school improvement, including but

PART III
Statutory Framework and Commentary
HELP AND CAPACITY-BUILDING

not limited to resources to assist teachers with curriculum, instructional, and assessment strategies; to assist principals with leadership and management training; to assist counselors and school aides with techniques for supporting high achievement; and to provide school leaders, including parents, with the means to organize and sustain school improvement efforts;

(C) disseminate to local educational agencies and schools information about educational practices and programs which will assist them in meeting the standards required by Section II, including staff development programs offered by universities and private providers.

(ii) In carrying out its duties pursuant to subsections (2)(c)(i)(B) and (C), each State educational agency shall ensure to all participating schools within its jurisdiction the availability of:

(A) assistance aimed at building the organizational capacity of the school as a whole, including helping the staff to learn how to analyze student achievement data, to develop and implement plans for school improvement, to remove barriers to student success, and to monitor progress; and,

(B) assistance with particular tasks such as redesigning science curricula, improving instruction in reading, enhanc-

ing skills of key professionals, and engaging parents.

(iii) State Educational Agency Plan, Budget, and Annual Report.

(A) On or before June 30, 1995, the State educational agency shall prepare and submit to the Secretary, with its application for assistance an initial plan and annual budget for programs and activities to be undertaken pursuant to subsection (c)(i).

(B) In each succeeding year, the State educational agency shall submit to the Secretary, with its application, an annual budget, and every two years, a revised plan and self-evaluation of programs and activities conducted during the preceding years pursuant to subsection (c)(i).

(3) FUNDING REQUIREMENTS FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

(a) Participating Schools

A participating school may spend up to 100 percent of the funds it receives under this Act on staff development and school improvement programs and activities authorized by this section, provided, however, that each participating school shall spend not less than 10 percent in 1994 and 1995, 15 percent in 1996, and 20 percent in 1997 and each year thereafter, of funds received annually under this Act for such programs and activities.

(b) Local Educational Agency Maintenance of Effort

[Provisions should be included to require maintenance of effort as to local educational agency expendi-

tures for staff development. No substantial change from concept in current law is recommended. The duty to maintain effort shall be imposed on the local educational agency, as a whole, and not on the individual school.]

(c) State Capacity-Building Grants

Eight percent of the annual appropriation in 1994 and 1995, seven percent in 1996-1998, and four percent in each year thereafter shall be used by State educational agencies to carry out the requirements of this section by awarding grants to qualified recipients to fulfill the purposes of subsection IV(2)(c)(ii). These funds, in the State educational agency's discretion, may also be used to support projects conducted within the State designed to demonstrate the following:

(i) innovative staff development and school improvement strategies and to test their effectiveness in improving the capacity of eligible schools to meet the standards required by Section II; and

(ii) research-based approaches to educating disadvantaged children, including instructional, curricular, and school-organization approaches.

Qualified recipients for state capacity-building grants shall be determined by each State educational agency.

(4) ELIGIBILITY

(a) All principals and other administrators, certified teachers and other staff, and paraprofessionals employed in participating schools are eligible to participate in staff development and school improvement programs funded in whole or in part under this

PART III
Statutory Framework and Commentary
HELP AND CAPACITY-BUILDING

section. Parents and guardians of children attending participating schools are also eligible.

(b) *To the extent that State educational agencies and local educational agencies undertake staff development programs for systemwide improvements in teaching, where the beneficiaries of the programs include both children in Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 schools, funds awarded under this Act may be used to pay for that portion of the program's cost that can be apportioned to participants employed in Chapter 1 schools, provided however that the programs are designed with an ultimate objective of enabling students who attend participating schools to achieve at the high levels required under this Act.*

(5) GUIDELINES FOR EFFECTIVE STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

(a) *The Secretary of Education, by June 30, 1995, shall publish guidelines for programs and activities funded under this section, which shall include:*

- (i) characteristics of effective staff development programs for the education of disadvantaged children;
- (ii) characteristics of effective approaches to schoolwide improvements;
- (iii) characteristics of effective parent education and involvement programs;
- (iv) examples of programs that have been demonstrated to be effective in achieving the purposes of this Act.

(b) *In specifying the characteristics of effective staff development and school improvement in guidelines adopted pursuant to subsection (5) (a), the Secretary shall take into account factors including but not limited to:*

- (i) whether the program provides sufficient time (including released time for teachers) and personnel for both training and follow-up activities, including feedback to, and supervision of participants who have completed the training, and ongoing time for instructional planning;
- (ii) whether staff development activities are part of an overall school improvement plan; and
- (iii) whether participants are assured sufficient resources (e.g., books, other material, supplies, equipment, and aides and support staff) to use the training effectively in the classroom.

(c) *The guidelines shall be disseminated widely to State educational agencies, to local educational agencies, and to parent and teacher associations.*

(6) OTHER MEASURES TO IMPROVE TEACHING

(a) *State and local educational agencies shall take steps to ensure that teachers in participating schools receive, from funding sources other than this Act, at least a proportionate share of staff development and other programs designed to update their skills and knowledge.*

(b) *State and local educational agencies are encouraged to establish other programs for teachers and paraprofessionals in participating schools to update and enhance their*

skills and knowledge. Such programs may include, but are not limited to, tuition reimbursement programs, internships, and participation in conferences and professional organizations. Local educational agencies may require participating teachers to make a contractual commitment to remain at their school for a period of time as a condition for receiving such training or other benefit under this subsection.

B Curriculum Development

(1) **STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES** shall assist local educational agencies and schools to develop curriculum aligned with the State standards required in Section II by developing and disseminating curriculum frameworks, guides, or model curricula.

(2) **THE FRAMEWORKS DEVELOPED** pursuant to subsection (1) shall help to assure that the curriculum in participating schools is multicultural, i.e., that it is responsive to and inclusive of the culture and heritage of a variety of racial and ethnic groups and that the curriculum is accessible to all students.

C National Board of Professional Teaching Standards Certification Program

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM**
A new program shall be established under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to provide bonuses to National Board of Professional

PART III
Statutory Framework and Commentary
HELP AND CAPACITY-BUILDING

Teaching Standards (NBPTS)-certified teachers who are employed in qualifying Chapter 1 schools, the program to be funded through an appropriation separate from the Chapter 1 formula distribution.

(2) ELIGIBLE PERSONS

All persons who possess National Board of Professional Teaching Standards certification and who are employed on a full-time basis in a professional capacity in a qualifying school or schools are eligible to receive the bonus.

(3) QUALIFYING SCHOOLS

Qualifying schools shall be participating schools in which at least 75 percent of students enrolled are from low-income families.

(4) AMOUNT OF STIPEND

The stipend shall be in the amount of \$2,500 per year. The Secretary shall be directed to devise a simple procedure for eligible persons, upon completion of a year of service in a qualifying school, to submit a short application, signed by his or her principal, to the Department. Stipend checks will be issued directly to the teacher by the federal government, bypassing the local educational agency, and shall be in addition to any other stipend or bonus to which the teacher may be entitled.

**★ The Commission's
Commentary on Help and
Capacity-Building**

INTRODUCTION

**1. The Needs of Schools and
School Districts**

This Framework contemplates that school districts and individual schools will be held accountable in new ways. They will be expected to work a transformation in the teaching of disadvantaged children so that children can achieve at the high levels called for under the Act. To accomplish this, schools will need help of various kinds. This section focuses on practical ways this help can be furnished through Chapter 1.

Local educational agencies will be called on to facilitate the empowerment of parents, teachers, and others at the building level. At the same time, school districts and schools will be freed from certain regulations and will be given more freedom to choose instructional strategies and to allocate resources. Local educational agencies and their staffs will need assistance to fulfill their new responsibilities and to use their new resources effectively. They will need to work cooperatively to identify needs for help and capacity-building and to select effective staff development and school improvement programs. Thus, local educational agencies will become both *recipients* and *providers* of help and capacity-building.

Teachers, principals, and other professional staff at the school level also will be held accountable for taking the steps necessary to secure performance at high levels by their students. Typically, teachers and principals will be given greater

latitude to design programs and to allocate resources. They may need:

- help in understanding why change is necessary and in *owning* the change process;
- continuing information: research and other developments in the subject matter they are teaching;
- access to information and training concerning effective teaching methods;
- help in learning how to analyze achievement patterns at their school and to assess overall school progress in meeting the standards called for in Secuon II;
- help in identifying needs and selecting priorities, assembling a plan of action, and other elements of decision-making;
- help in learning how to communicate and work with parents as partners in their children's education;
- access to information about the availability of professional and school development assistance, including that offered by State educational agencies, local educational agencies and others, and about the effectiveness of each service or program;
- the ability to select programs to meet their needs; and
- help in learning how to control and evaluate staff development and other school improvement services.

They will also need specific assistance in effectively involving parents (Section V); in developing curriculum (this section); in administering the new assessments (Section VII), and in addressing the health and social service needs of students (Secuon VI). Thus, this Framework

PART III
Statutory Framework and Commentary
HELP AND CAPACITY-BUILDING

contemplates that *teachers and principals* will be actively involved in determining their needs for professional development and other assistance needed for their schools to achieve the standards required in Section II.

Many Chapter 1 programs employ *aides or paraprofessionals* to assist certified staff. In general the Commission would discourage the widespread, routine hiring of aides with Chapter 1 funds. The Commission contemplates instead that successful schools will invest a substantial proportion of their Chapter 1 resources in improving the skills and knowledge of adults in the school community. If the practice of using aides continues, however, they too will need to participate in high-quality staff development along with certified staff. Thus, the Act contemplates that aides will also become *recipients* of help and capacity-building.

Parents are critical to a child's educational success. The Framework recognizes the need for schools to empower and support parents in their important roles as caregivers and as facilitators of learning and literacy (Section V). Strategies for involving parents must be a component of staff development so that teachers, aides, and administrators learn to work effectively with parents to ensure students' success. Parents should also become *recipients* of help and capacity-building under the Act and may deliver such help to one another.

2. The Needs of State Educational Agencies

The Framework gives State educational agencies substantial additional responsibilities with regard to compliance and enforcement (Section VIII), developing and administering the new assessments (Section VII), and providing increased levels of assistance to school districts in the areas of curriculum and staff development (this section). Thus, the Commission proposes that states assume the primary role for *facilitating* the provision of high-quality professional and school development assistance. It is recognized that most State educational agencies currently do not have the capacity to do this. Accordingly, this section provides a set-aside of funds with which State agencies may (1) identify and publicize resources for staff development and technical assistance available to districts in their state, (2) award capacity-building grants or contracts to organizations or individuals that provide high-quality staff development or technical assistance, and (3) to the extent necessary, strengthen their internal capacity to support and oversee the local process of school improvement. Although State educational agencies may choose to offer their own staff development programs to local educational agencies and to schools, it is not contemplated that State educational agencies will become the primary providers of staff development programs. Local educational agencies will be free to select providers from a variety of sources. Rather, State educational agencies will become the repository in each state

of good information and advice to their districts on how and where to best meet locally defined needs.

3. University and Private Service Providers

These organizations have an important role in researching, developing, and evaluating programs and in providing staff development and other services. Under the Framework, local educational agencies are encouraged to select high-quality programs that show promise or demonstrated effectiveness, and they may purchase services from university and private providers. State educational agencies are encouraged to become primary providers of "consumer guidance" to local educational agencies and schools regarding effective and worthwhile programs.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

1. Staff Development and School Improvement Requirements

The Commission recognizes that:

Chapter 1 could magnify its impact substantially if a portion of Chapter 1 funds could be devoted to improving the curriculum, instructional practices, classroom management skills, assessment practices, and other skills of the regular classroom teachers with whom Chapter 1 students spend most of their day, and to enable schools to engage in schoolwide improvements in organization, professional development, and parent involvement. R. Slavin, Staff Development and R & D in Chapter 1 Programs of the Future, (Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, May 1992).

PART III
Statutory Framework and Commentary
HELP AND CAPACITY-BUILDING

Toward this end, the Commission recommends in this Section that a substantial portion of Chapter 1 resources be spent on staff development and school improvement programs, at both the state and local levels. It is the Commission's belief that the ambitious staff development effort contemplated in this Framework is critical to ensure that students receive the high-level curriculum and instruction needed to achieve both the expected levels of performance on the new state assessments and the National Education Goals set by the Governors and others.

Subsection A (1) makes clear that staff development and school improvement measures prescribed in this section are to be undertaken for the overarching purpose of elevating student achievement.

Subsection A (2) delineates the specific responsibilities of educators at both the building and district levels to build the capacity of schools to achieve the goals. The term "staff development and school improvement" (emphasis added) intentionally is used to communicate the idea that the approach contemplated by this section is a comprehensive one, not necessarily limited to traditional teacher-training models.

Subsection A (2) (a) delineates the central role of the schools themselves as units of change. Subsection A (2) (a) (ii) requires each participating school to prepare a student achievement plan upon which the Chapter 1 program, including staff development and

school improvement activities, will be based. The plan must be prepared with involvement of the whole school community—including parents—and is to be completed before Chapter 1 dollars are expended. The student achievement plan is to be based on an analysis of achievement patterns at the school and the school's vision of where it needs to go if all students are to succeed in meeting the new, high standards required by Section II. Subsection A (2) (a) (iii) requires schools to focus attention on students who have difficulty meeting the standards and to seek parental support for measures to help the children succeed. This requirement applies to all students in all grades and in each subject taught in participating schools, irrespective of whether the school or local educational agency has decided to target Chapter 1 funds to particular grade levels subjects, or students pursuant to subsection III A (7) (b).

Subsection A (2) (b) contemplates a role for local educational agencies in assisting and supporting the schools in their school improvement efforts. The section permits, although it does not require, local educational agencies to use Chapter 1 dollars for systemwide programs, for example, preparing bilingual instructors. This section requires, on a systemwide basis, plans similar to those required under subsection A (2) (a) for individual schools.

Subsection A (2) (c) delineates the major role State educational agencies will be asked to play in building school and school-district capacity. There are essentially four components of the State educational agency program:

1. to support local school improvement efforts by developing and funding initiatives to increase the availability of high-quality staff development and other professional assistance in the State.
2. to provide intensive support and funding for innovative and exemplary programs.
3. to disseminate information about effective practices and strategies to participating schools and local educational agencies; and
4. to enforce the provisions of this and the other Framework sections.

One approach to compliance with subsection (2) (c) (ii) suggested by Commissioners might involve the use of "school change specialists." The State educational agency would develop a cadre of education specialists and make their services available to participating schools throughout the State. Among the tasks of the specialists would be to help build leadership in the school by working with parents and other community people as well as with school personnel. The leadership group would be trained, *inter alia*, in using data to analyze problems, in identifying criteria for success and accountability, and in monitoring progress.

Subsection A (3) specifies how staff development programs will be funded and provides that school and State Chapter 1 funds be earmarked for such purposes. The Commission believes that high-quality staff development is well worth the cost and is an essential component of the reforms that are needed. Although

|
PART III
Statutory Framework and Commentary
HELP AND CAPACITY-BUILDING

this program arguably could take funds away from direct service, the Commission believes that the remaining funds would be spent on more effective teaching as a result. See, e.g., R. Slavin, *Staff Development and R & D in Chapter 1 Programs of the Future*, *supra*.

Subsection (3)(c) provides funding for State-awarded capacity-building grants to fulfill the requirements of subsection (2)(c)(ii). States may also choose to establish a demonstration grant program to provide an infusion of dollars to projects that demonstrate effective research-based approaches in participating schools or that employ innovative staff development and school improvement strategies. In any case, states are free to determine criteria for awarding either capacity-building or demonstration grants and to establish eligibility criteria [subsection (3)(d)]. There is nothing in this Framework to prevent States from awarding grants to universities, to not-for-profit organizations, or to for-profit entities, provided the projects meet the state's criteria, are conducted in the State, and otherwise comply with federal and state law. The Framework frontloads the State-initiated capacity-building system by allocating more dollars for these grants to State educational agencies during the first two years to enable states to build their own capacity in this area and to provide seed money to expand the availability of high-quality professional assistance.

The set-aside for school-based capacity-building, however, would be phased in over three years. Subsection (3)(a) would reserve 10 percent for such purposes in year one, 15 percent in year two, and 20 percent in year three and in each succeeding year. It is noted that schools, of course, are free to spend more than the required percentage on staff development if they so choose.

Although local educational agencies and State educational agencies are not required to contribute from their own resources to staff development programs required under this section, the maintenance of effort requirement [subsection (3)(b)] ensures that Chapter 1 will not supplant existing programs.

Subsections (4)(a) and (b) will permit Chapter 1 to fund a broad range of staff development for regular classroom teachers in Chapter 1 schools and is not limited to funding only those teachers and aides who work exclusively with students identified as needing remedial assistance. Subsection (4), as written, is designed to allow flexibility in designing and carrying out staff development programs, and it permits training of teachers in Chapter 1 schools on a schoolwide basis, as well as in specific subjects or grade levels. The theory is that schoolwide improvements will benefit all children—including economically and educationally disadvantaged children. Subsection (4)(a) clarifies that parents and paraprofessionals may also be included in staff development or other training programs funded under this section.

Subsection (4)(b) clarifies that Chapter 1 dollars may pay for a portion of certain districtwide staff development programs, provided they are geared toward the higher order learning goals of the Act. For example, Chapter 1 could pay for a *pro rata* share of a districtwide retraining of teachers in math or science, under the theory that Chapter 1 children would benefit from their teachers' participation. The subsection recognizes that because all students, and low-income students specifically, will be held to the same high standards, it makes sense both economically and programmatically to support staff development programs geared toward systemwide improvements. The maintenance-of-effort provision in subsection (3)(b) should ensure that this subsection does not permit supplanting. A minority of Commissioners, however, have expressed a concern that the provision as written would result in supplanting and unequal expenditure of non-Chapter 1 funds.

The guidelines for effective staff development and school improvement programs required to be promulgated by the Secretary of Education in subsection (5)(a) are intended to be a resource for states, schools, and school districts. Failure to abide by them, however, would not result in sanctions or any enforcement action. The elements of effective programs delineated in subsection (5)(b) are drawn largely from the work of N. Adelman and D. Spiro, *Staff Development for Teachers of Disadvantaged Students* (Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, June 1991).

|
PART III
Statutory Framework and Commentary
HELP AND CAPACITY-BUILDING

2. Curriculum Development

The Commission recognizes the need for schools and school districts to develop curricula aligned with the higher standards called for by Section II.

Subsection (B) requires the development of state-based curriculum *frameworks*, guides, and model curricula. But it does not require a nationally or state-mandated curriculum.

3. Incentives for Improving Teaching in Chapter 1 Schools

The Commission recognizes and salutes the dedication and often unrecognized achievements of the thousands of talented professionals who work in our Nation's most troubled and neglected school

systems. It is a fact of life, however, that there are few incentives for our Nation's most capable teachers to work in schools with the highest concentrations of poor children. On the contrary, there are a variety of factors which work to diminish the overall quality of instruction delivered at such schools. Within metropolitan and regional labor markets, experienced and better educated teachers are often attracted by the higher salaries, lower pupil-staff ratios, better facilities and other working conditions present in more well-to-do jurisdictions. On an intradistrict basis, local educational agency policies may permit more experienced teachers to choose to transfer to schools with few disadvantaged students. As a consequence, children in schools with large numbers of children from low-income families are, on the average, taught by teachers with less experience and less expertise than their more advantaged peers.

The Commission proposes in subsection IV D to establish a federally funded and administered program to provide positive incentives for professionals to serve economically disadvantaged children. The program, simply, would provide a \$2,500 cash bonus to those teachers and other professionals who have met the high and rigorous standards or practice set by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards *and* who teach in schools with very high concentrations of children from low-income families. The Commission is confident that such an initiative by the federal government could begin to attract the most competent educators to work in the schools where their talents are most needed.

Mr. TOWNS. Let me thank all three of you for your very powerful testimony. I've been around here a long time, but that testimony was very moving.

So, why don't we take a 10 minute break and we'll be right back.
[Recess.]

Mr. TOWNS. Let me first say again that I though that your testimony was outstanding, all of you, and I would like to begin by talking to you, Doctor Haycock. You talked about a set-aside, developing a strategy. I'm very interested in that. I think that in order to turn this situation around, I think we'll have to do things differently, and I think that is an approach that I would like for you to just talk a little more about it and see what we might be able to do to try to institute it.

Ms. HAYCOCK. Thank you.

As bob indicated, in the end what we are trying to do is change what goes on in every classroom in the schools serving poor kinds. What that often means, of course, is both helping the teacher to deepen his or her knowledge of the subject that they are teaching, but also to learn the range of instructional strategies that would be effective in getting kids to master that content.

We think it's very important, if you are going to hold teachers accountable for getting larger numbers of their kids to state standards, that they really have the opportunity to think through the kind of help they need to get there and to make decisions about choice of professional development. This is why we thought it was very important to drive the dollars and the decisions about professional development all the way to the school level. If you are going to hold folks accountable, they ought to have a say over how they use those resources.

So, we suggest that in year one of a new chapter 1 that 10 percent of the dollars that get to the building level should be spent on professional or school development, and that over a 4-year period that amount grows to about 20 percent. This is what, as we tried to cost out what it stakes over a year to help teachers and administrators learn this stuff gets you close to the amount it takes.

At the same time, because we worry that the demand for high-quality professional development from these schools would outstrip the supply of high-quality development, we started out in year one with a 7 percent set-aside at the State level that would be used to identify high-quality providers in professional development, whose capacity was proven by research to make a difference and grow it fast.

Over time, that support will decline as the amount of money put in school level hands grows, so that eventually what you get is precisely what Bob suggested, and that's to kind of a market-driven system, where we would support anything with state dollars that wasn't considered by teachers and administrators to be helpful in their efforts to improve achievement.

But, again, we think it's critical that it happen through chapter 1 as opposed to chapter 2, because that's the only way that drives dollars all the way to the school level. And it's the only what that puts disproportionate dollars where the need is greatest, and I can't tell you how important that is. If you just give the money to districts and say, spend this and help any of your schools, they al-

most always help the more affluent schools because they are first in line. Those schools always have the best proposal, they always compete more effectively for those dollars.

Mr. TOWNS. And, they always have the strongest voices to fight for the dollars.

Ms. HAYCOCK. Yes, they have that, too.

Mr. TOWNS. Let me ask, do you think that we could achieve the administration's goal of securing higher standards for all children if we leave it to the States to conduct the assessments? Should the Department of Education be involved in the assessment process, or do you think the Department should just do national assessment standards and leave it alone?

Mr. SLAVIN. Which one?

Mr. TOWNS. Either one of you.

Mr. SLAVIN. I think that the best combination of approaches is one that has the Department of Education setting general standards for what is an adequate set of State standards and what is an adequate set of State assessments, but the individual States would have the freedom to develop their own assessments and their own standards to meet their own needs. One of the wonderful things about America is that we have 50 laboratories for change, and I think it's important not to have the Federal Government say that this is exactly how you must set standards and this is how you must assess student progress, but rather, to leave some freedom for innovation, for development of new knowledge for the States to experiment with, and then learn over the course of time how best to do it.

Mr. SIMERING. I guess from my perspective I have no problem with standards, I have no problem with assessment, there's an awful lot of discussion about it but I think I've heard it said before, you know, how do you fatten the cow by weighing it. If we are going to continue to measure the kids, I think we ought to take a stronger look at what we are going to do in the classroom to help them reach those standards, as opposed to putting, you know, all of our emphasis on, you know, what type of measure we are going to use to assess them. And, I think that's one of the areas that we have some concern when we see things like professional development and recommendations, that money being taken out of money that's already in there in the chapter 1 classrooms, that we think that some additional money has to be spent to raise both the teaching standards and the performance of the kids, and we've got to look at what goes on in the classroom.

Whatever measure, as long as it's fair, as long as it's developed with recognition of cultural differences and learning styles of the kids, that's fine with the Great City Schools. We need some help, basically, to help to get the kids to those standards.

Mr. TOWNS. Some schools may be setting lower standards, what do we do in a case like that, if the school is sort of setting lower standards?

Mr. SIMERING. Well, I think we need to have standards that are pretty much uniform and set highly. The question is to get the kids moving, and to some extent it's the instruction in that classroom that has the low expectation that's forcing those kinds into only

doing the drill and remediation types of approaches and not moving forward into the higher level skills.

Mr. TOWNS. Let me ask this question, my time has expired. What is the greatest benefit and also the greatest threat that every district will face under the administration's proposal?

Mr. SIMERING. The greatest benefit, I think, is the targeting proposal, that we will, in theory, get some additional resources to help us make progress with our children to meet these various national goals and standards.

I think the greatest threat within the proposal to some extent is, it appears to be potentially a zero-sum gain in that dollars are being taken from programs that are being terminated and used for supposedly new initiative, but the bottom line is, no additional investment in education. And, I think we had hoped that the reauthorization proposal would signal a rededication on the part of the Federal Government to seize the opportunity and make an additional commitment monetarily, and we don't see that within the SEA proposal.

Mr. TOWNS. Thank you very much, and I yield to Congressman Mica.

Mr. MICA. I had some questions relating to increasing the set-aside for professional development, and is it now somewhere around 5 percent or 7 percent?

Ms. HAYCOCK. There's no set-aside.

Mr. MICA. There's no set-aside, but, I mean, under the proposal in the initial years, 5 to 7, and increasing to 20, is that correct?

Ms. HAYCOCK. Yes.

Mr. MICA. What kinds of professional development are we talking about, or is it his pretty much left to local discretion? Is there any standard?

Ms. HAYCOCK. Let me answer that in two ways. The choice of providers, and who comes to your school, would be a decision made by the teachers and administrators at the school. But, you can easily anticipate the types of help they'll need.

The first type is school-wide help, help with rethinking where the school is going, creating a vision and an action plan. Most of these schools need help in organization development, because there's no cohesion, there's no focus, they simply reel from crisis to crisis and, need help getting out of that cycle.

The other kinds of help typically are more particular to the subjects being taught. This ranges from, again, helping teachers to learn more about their subjects because many of them didn't learn enough when they were in college to learning what research suggests works in helping kids to learn.

Mr. MICA. that was really something I was questioning, is that, is this a remedial education program for teachers that haven't made the grade?

Ms. HAYCOCK. Well, the truth is that, as a nation, we are asking teachers to teach kids to standards that never applied in the past, and to be successful, not just with a few kids, but with all of our American children. This is something that no teacher is fully prepared for.

So, it's not remedial for a few teachers. The truth is that none of us have been educated in the ways that we're proposing.

Mr. MICA. Well, I don't know. I keep hearing all this gobbledygook about, you know, we haven't taught people in the way that they should have been taught, and we don't have the programs and things, but, my God, for two decades now in following education coming out as an educator, you get down to some pretty basic skills.

And, in the schools I've visited, and in the teachers I've talked to, the school superintendents, they can identify the problem students. I mean, and they can't read, they can't write, they can't perform basic skills.

If the teacher can't teach, then maybe—and we're producing teachers that can't teach, do we have a problem in these urban areas attracting teachers? Is that part of the problem, that we have to keep incompetence in the classroom, in that we have to ignore the basic skills that aren't being taught?

Ms. HAYCOCK. It's a problem far more pervasive than just in urban classrooms.

Mr. MICA. You know, in the private sector, I fire them if they can't perform, you fire them. You try to deal with them, and you do have some—but, if you have a record of lack of ability to perform your function, and here an educator, that we are paying more money for remedial, we are letting the kids go beyond the third grade without basic skills, there's something wrong.

Now, are we just putting more Band-Aids on the problems we've seen in the past by talking in "Washingtonese" language that we're correcting the problem?

Ms. HAYCOCK. What we've done in Washington is really quite different from what you are proposing. What we've done in Washington is, every time we diagnose a new problem, more poor kids, we create a comp-ed program; more bilingual kids, we create a bilingual ed program; more dropouts, we create a dropout prevention program. What we do is, create little pots of money, we give them to schools and we say, do a special program for these kids, because we don't trust you to act in their behalf yourselves.

This approach has awful effects. We've created huge bloated bureaucracies of people who are administering each of these pots of money. We've distracted educators from focusing on what they really should focus on, which is improving what goes on in the regular classroom. And we've robbed kids who most need coherence of any kind of coherence in their education. Many children basically ping-pong from one program to another, because we've said it's the kids that are broken not the schools.

What we are trying to do, what the administration is trying to do, and what we very much support, is press the notion that we have a very much changed economy that requires us to be successful with all of our kids, not just a few. And, once you decide that, it means you need to help teachers who were educated in the old system to learn how to reorganize their schools and classrooms in ways that help larger numbers of students to master necessary skills. That's why we need to focus on the standards. That's why we need to help teachers to learn that which they've never learned before.

Mr. SLAVIN. I think, there is a problem of incompetent teachers for a small proportion of teachers who are out there, but there's a

much, much, much larger group of teachers who are, you know, of average competence, who could be excellent teachers but are not excellent teachers today. And, it's not a question of remedial instructions, it's a question, you know, in any business that experiences technological change, that experiences new technologies, you know, that are coming along, or new ideas that are coming along, you invest in the people who are going to do the job. You can fire some of them, but you can't fire all of them. You've got to invest in the people, not just at the beginning stage, but throughout their professional careers.

That's all we are talking about, is giving people the best programs, the best practices, the best materials that we know how to give them, so that they can do the job that they are supposed to do in the classroom.

Mr. MICA. We're going to spend \$60 million to hook them in to a computer program that gives them access to all these Federal programs.

Mr. SLAVIN. That's not a starting proposition. I mean, seeing something on a computer is not a starting proposition for professional development.

Mr. MICA. Which allows them back to dip back into what she just talked about, creating all these programs.

I attended a hearing the other day, and they told me we have, let's see, we have somebody from Detroit, I don't know if you were there, but Chairman Conyers was there, Representative from Detroit, we have 600 welfare programs, Federal welfare programs, and that they had to deal with 350 to 400 in Detroit, 100 Federal job-training programs. I'm afraid to ask how many there are in education.

Mr. SLAVIN. We're not asking for new programs.

Mr. MICA. It sounds like you are headed, that this is headed in the right direction, but I'm a little bit concerned that it may be a Band-Aid approach to a bigger problem.

Mr. SIMERING. It is a huge problem. For example, at least in Chicago, and I think in most of the older cities, probably the age of our teaching population is right at about 50 years old, so you are talking about people that have been out of college, have been out of their training for, you know, pushing 30 years. So, you do need to, as in private industry, retool your staff, and I think it's been a significant omission on the part of American education for not having done that over the years, and I think we are feeling the brunt of that.

Second, you did say that, is there a teacher shortage, in the big city school systems there certainly is a teacher shortage. We cannot attract teachers to a big city school system because of pay, because of other types of conditions, and it is a major problem in terms of getting teachers in to teach the kids that need the help the most.

Mr. MICA. Well, I'll yield back at this time. Thank you.

Mr. TOWNS. Thank you very much, Congressman Mica.

Let me thank all the witnesses for your testimony. I think you've been extremely helpful, and, again, thank you very, very much.

Mr. TOWNS. At this time, we will call the next panel, Dr. Sharon Edwards Simmons, supervisor of early childhood education, New York City Public Schools, and Dr. Gerard G. Leeds, co-chairperson

of the Institute for Community Development. And, Doctor Leeds is being accompanied by Dr. Dickerson.

Mr. LEEDS. By the way, it's Mr. Leeds.

Mr. TOWNS. Right, Dr. Dickerson and Mr. Leeds.

Why don't you begin, Dr. Simmons. It's good to see you. We know of your outstanding work, so I'm delighted to welcome you to the committee.

STATEMENTS OF SHARON EDWARDS SIMMONS, SUPERVISOR OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION, NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS; GERARD G. LEEDS, COCHAIRPERSON OF THE INSTITUTE FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT; AND DOCTOR LAVINIA DICKERSON

Ms. SIMMONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to come and testify before your committee.

I will address my comments on how inner city schools will benefit under the administration's bill.

My remarks will be based on my experience as a supervisor of early childhood education in Community School District 19, which is in the East New York section of Brooklyn, along with my experience of being an assistant adjunct professor at Brooklyn College of the City University of New York.

Community School District 19 services more than 23,000 students. The district has an average poverty level of 86 percent, and 22 of our 27 elementary schools have a poverty rate of over 75 percent.

Under the administration's bill, schools will receive their chapter 1 allocations based on the poverty level, rather than based on low academic achievement of the students.

I will focus my comments and make recommendations on three areas where the administration's bill could benefit inner city schools. The three areas are:

First, providing for high quality early childhood programs;

Second, restructuring schools to better facilitate student achievement; and

Third, providing sufficient resources for professional and organizational development.

Research has shown that providing preschool children with high quality early childhood programs are very cost effective. Furthermore, it saves the taxpayers money, more money, than not providing these programs. It has been shown that even the cost factor can be six times less.

High quality programs for preschool children have had their participants exhibiting fewer needs requiring special education. Participants are more likely to graduate from high school, they are more likely to enroll in post-secondary education, they exhibit lower arrest records, are less likely to be on welfare as adults, and exhibit fewer incidents of premarital teenage pregnancy, and display a higher employment rate.

In Community School District 19, seven of our elementary schools have pre-kindergarten programs. They service 378 children. However, we have more than 250 children on waiting lists, waiting to be served. Parents and principals of all of the elementary schools have said that they would like to have pre-kindergarten programs,

but the present chapter 1 funding does not allow for having pre-kindergarten programs in each elementary school.

However, chapter 1 regulations for pre-kindergarten programs have specific specifications, which include:

Using developmentally appropriate curricula;

Parent involvement in the decision making processes;

Health screening;

Food, nutritional and social service components that provide linkages with community-based organizations;

Ongoing professional development of the pre-kindergarten staff; and

Adequate staffing patterns to ensure the program's effectiveness.

Since high quality pre-kindergarten programs have been shown to have lasting effects on the lives of children, I strongly recommend that every chapter 1 school have at least one pre-kindergarten class. This program will help to guarantee that all children will enter school ready to learn.

Additionally, by requiring the components of the pre-kindergarten program, at least up to third grade, it will help ensure that all children have the opportunity to learn and succeed in school.

Because it is easier to monitor chapter 1 programs by having a pull-out program, there are many schools throughout the country that are using this program for remedial purposes, that's the pull-out program. However, this program is not congruent with developmentally appropriate practices.

Developmentally appropriate practices includes hands-on learning, and experiential learning, where children are receiving instructions involving the whole context of learning and themes, rather than isolated skills. There is a large amount of critical thinking and problem solving that goes on in the classroom.

Drills and practice, remedial drills and practice, are limited based on integrating the curriculum.

Based on the continuation of the pre-program model, I would recommend the following:

First, eliminate the use of pull-out programs and replace them with developmentally appropriate practices.

Second, restructure the use of remedial drill and practice in favor of enriched interdisciplinary activities that promote critical thinking.

Third, ensure that parents will be involved in all aspects of the program.

Fourth, increase the funding for the Even Start Family Literacy Program to help parents become more literate and to give them parenting skills.

Fifth, increase the number of prekindergarten programs at every site.

Based on the school restructuring model, and staff development organizations, I would highly recommend that the bill put aside money for—additional money for staff development that would be earmarked just for that purpose. We need to have schools work on changing the way children are taught, where the teachers and the principals and everyone in the schools will become learners.

We cannot continue to use the methodology that's been used over the past 40 and 50 years, because society has changed tremendously.

So, in closing, Mr. Chairman, I would recommend linkages with colleges and universities, who can show us and help us in doing research and demonstrating what has worked with inner city children, who can have programs to build the capacity of the schools at their sites, and could make everyone work towards students achieving.

Thank you for your time.

Mr. TOWNS. Thank you very much for your testimony.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Simmons follows:]

Good afternoon Mr. Chairman and Members of the Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee. My name is Dr. Sharon Edwards Simmons. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your invitation to be a witness during your hearing on "Improving America's School Act of 1993: The Implications for Urban Districts." My comments will address how inner city schools will benefit under the Administration's bill.

My remarks will be based on my experience as a Supervisor of Early Childhood Education in Community School District 19, in the East New York section of Brooklyn, New York and as an Assistant Professor of Education (adjunct) at Brooklyn College of the City University of New York.

Community School District 19 services over 23,000 students in 21 elementary schools, 6 intermediate schools, and 1 family academy. The District has an average poverty rate of 86% and 22 of our 27 schools have a poverty level of over 75%. Brooklyn College enrolls teachers who are employed throughout the New York City area. As an adjunct professor at Brooklyn College, I come into contact with countless teachers who work in Chapter 1 schools, provide direct services to Chapter 1 students, or have knowledge of how some aspects of Chapter 1 programs work.

Under the Administration's bill, schools will receive their Chapter 1 allocation on the basis of a school's poverty level, (the number of poor children) rather than on the basis of low achievement (the number of low-achieving students). Additionally, districts and schools with the highest concentration of poverty will receive a substantial increase in resources when compared to the old bill.

I will focus my comments and make recommendations on three areas where the Administration's bill could benefit inner city schools. The three areas are:

- 1) providing for high quality early childhood programs.
- 2) restructuring schools to better facilitate student achievement, and
- 3) providing sufficient resources for professional and organizational development.

Research has indicated that providing children at risk of poor academic

achievement with a high quality early childhood program is cost-effective. Furthermore, it has been shown that the cost to tax payers of not operating a 1-year high quality pre-school program for disadvantaged children is 6 times that of providing the service (Berrueta-Clements, Schweinhart, Barnett, Epstein, and Weinkart, 1984). When comparing disadvantaged pre-school children who have attended a high quality pre-school program with those who have not, it was found that children who attended programs:

- * exhibited fewer needs requiring special education referral
- * were more likely to graduate from high school
- * were more likely to enroll in post-secondary education
- * exhibited lower arrest records
- * were less likely to be on welfare as young adults
- * exhibited fewer incidences of premarital teenage pregnancy
- * displayed a higher employment rate
- * exhibited significantly higher scores on school-based achievement measures throughout the elementary years

In Community School District 19, only 7 of our 21 elementary schools have prekindergarten programs. These seven schools service 378 four-year old children with more than 250 children on a waiting list hoping to attend. Although many principals have indicated that they want prekindergarten programs in their schools, funding has not been available for us to expand this Chapter I program.

Chapter I regulations for prekindergarten programs have specific stipulations which include:

- * developmentally appropriate curricula.
- * parental involvement in the decision making process and participation in workshops and training that they have determined meets their needs.
- * health screening .
- * food and nutrition components.
- * social service component with linkages formed with community agencies (health, social services, recreational, vocational, etc.) to help meet needs of children and their families.

- * ongoing professional development of the prekindergarten staff.
- * adequate staffing patterns to ensure program effectiveness.

Since high quality prekindergarten programs have been shown to have lasting effects on the lives of children who attend, I strongly recommend that every Chapter I school have at least one prekindergarten class. This program will help to guarantee that children are ready for school.

Early childhood education in New York City Public Schools includes children who attend prekindergarten through the third grade. Promoting program continuity between prekindergarten, kindergarten, first, second, and third grade must be a goal for Chapter I programs. Components of prekindergarten programs such as developmentally appropriate curriculum and services provided through collaborative planning, an interdisciplinary approach to learning, parent involvement, and establishment of a foundation for success and lifelong learning should be extended to the third grade. Developmentally appropriate practices includes using teaching and learning methodologies that are both age and individual appropriate. Age appropriate refers to matching curriculum and instruction to the physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development of children. Individual appropriateness refers to the unique modes of learning and the capacity of each child.

Programs that pull low achievers out of regular classes for remedial instruction are incongruent with more developmentally appropriate practices. Developmentally appropriate approaches include hands-on learning and exploration; a focus on whole concepts and themes rather than isolated skills; assessment based on observation; and settings that allow children of varying abilities to interact and work at their own pace. Critical thinking and problem solving techniques, along with integrating the curriculum by using themes that have relevance for young children, are more likely to provide a successful learning experience than remedial drills and practice.

Based on the continuation of the prekindergarten model, I would recommend the following:

- I. Eliminate the use of pull-out programs and replace them with developmentally appropriate practices.

2. Restrict the use of remedial drill and practice in favor of enriched interdisciplinary activities that include promoting critical thinking.
3. Ensure that parents will be involved in all aspects of program planning and decision making rather than making all of the decisions for them.
4. Increase the funding for the Even Start Family Literacy Program in order to help parents of young children obtain literacy and parenting skills.
5. Increase the number of prekindergarten programs to ensure children's readiness for school and increase their opportunities for success, rather than only fund a few in each state.

School restructuring and professional and organizational development go hand in hand. By providing funding based on poverty, each school will have the opportunity for restructuring in a manner that best supports student achievement and high standards. According to Phil Schlechty, President of the Center for Leadership in School Reform, restructuring is changing the system of rules, roles, and relationships that govern the way time, people, space, knowledge, and technology are used and employed.

In order for students to have the capacity to change and prosper in the volatile global work force of today, they must be able to manage complexity, find and use resources, continually learn new technologies, approaches, and opportunities. Along with many other responsibilities, the school must provide all students with the opportunity to learn and achieve at high levels. Today's global, technological society also demands that its citizens be able to understand and evaluate multi-dimensional problems and alternatives and manage diverse and complex social systems.

Furthermore, the skills that students will need to compete in the 21st century will require competence in technologies that we cannot presently envision. However, if students are nurtured in an environment that promotes success and competencies, while developing their ability to reason, they will succeed.

These changes in society and of the work force of today, require that schools be able to deliver instructional services as well as ensure that all students learn at high levels. Teachers must be able to facilitate the development of diverse

learners and create classroom environments that are conducive to developing their students' talents in effective and powerful ways. For example, students must be able to use mathematics to solve real problems, not just manipulate numbers; writing projects and scientific experiments must have some relevance to what is happening in the real world.

In Phil Schlechty's view, teacher must become leaders and inventors. Schools must be restructured so that teachers work together in order to invent work that their students can do. Teachers must guide, facilitate, and direct students in doing work that requires higher level and critical thinking skills. This is a more complex approach to teaching. It requires that teachers be able to combine knowledge of subject matter as well as possess a wide repertoire of teaching strategies, while understanding students' growth, experience, and development. Teachers must be able to diversify their practices in order to engage each student in whatever ways are necessary to encourage learning.

Since teachers will become instructional leaders and learners, principals will become leaders of instruction and learning. In fact, the whole school must change to become a community of learners and the principal becomes the chief facilitator of learning. This changing view of the school requires building the capacity of whole schools to ensure that all students learn to think critically, to invent, to produce, and to solve problems. In other words, schools must become self-critical, and self-regulating as they continuously focus on results. Capacity building requires finding different approaches to producing, sharing, and using knowledge than those that have been traditionally used.

Several things must happen in order to build the capacity of schools. Administrators and school staff must work with parents to assist them in becoming full partners in their children's education. Teachers, parents, and administrators must form school teams to establish short- and long-range goals that will facilitate the teaching and learning process. The total school community must focus on improving results and developing outcomes that will increase student achievement and promote high expectations for learning. This restructuring of schools changes roles to effectively change outcomes.

These changes cannot happen without support, professional and organizational development, and the desire of the school community to change. Professional development is needed to train staff in methodologies that have been proven

through research to increase the achievement of students. Teachers and administrators need to understand the theories that drive their practices and be able to plan and achieve specific goal and outcomes. Organizational development requires that school teams have the skills and knowledge to develop a philosophy and mission that focuses on student achievement and drives everything that the school does. Organizational and staff development are needed to support planning teams in developing school restructuring plans, understanding budgets, setting goals and timelines, and evaluating their progress.

I, therefore, recommend that the Administration's bill support, monitor, and provide technical assistance that promotes whole school improvement and restructuring.

In Community School District 19, under the leadership of Levander Lilly, a renaissance is developing. A partnership with the Metro Center of New York University (Dr. LeMar Miller, Director) has been formed to ensure student achievement. Our rebirth and revival is called Renaissance Nineteen. Under the umbrella of Renaissance Nineteen, Superintendent Lilly has provided district level support by developing the capacity of district office staff to facilitate school level changes through planning teams.

Each of the 28 schools in the district have school-based planning teams that can establish school priorities and develop curricula and standards for the school to achieve. In addition to providing training to facilitate school planning teams, New York University collaborated with members of the District 19 Early Childhood community to plan, develop, and implement the Renaissance Nineteen Early Childhood Summer Institute. Dr. Frances Rust, author of Changing Teaching, Changing Schools: Bring Early Childhood Practice into Public Education was the facilitator from New York University, with assistance from Nancy Klein, education consultant, and myself.

Seventeen members of the District 19 community, including principals, teachers, assistant principals, staff developers, and district office personnel, developed a district-wide philosophy for early childhood education and a resource guide. The philosophy states our beliefs regarding early childhood education and the principles and foundation for our work with children, staff, parents, and administrators. The resource guide is designed for teachers and administrators who are engaged in developing and implementing early childhood practice throughout the district. It consists of an assessment instrument, activities, materials, and a bibliography.

The assessment instrument serves as a guide for assessing early childhood practices and programs and establishes goals for practice toward which schools can work. Six areas are addressed in the assessment instrument: interaction among staff and children, curriculum, staff/parent interactions, staff qualifications and development, staffing levels, and the physical environment of an early childhood program. The activities are samples of the types of experiences common to early childhood settings that bring together multiple areas of curriculum, promote verbal development, and enhance children's thinking and problem solving skills. These activities are drawn from "Talents Unlimited", a teaching/learning program that integrates creative and critical thinking skills and from "Beginning Science Equitably", a science program designed to promote science and math learning in young children. The list of materials assists teachers in setting up their classrooms with the appropriate materials. The bibliography includes books, references to research, and resources guides which are useful for anyone who wishes to explore any topic in greater depth.

Developing staff is a crucial factor in supporting student achievement based on high standards. I recommend that the Administration's bill set aside a guaranteed amount of funding for professional and organizational development. We do not have guaranteed funding to support programs such as Renaissance Nineteen. We need funding for high quality professional and organization development that will help us to enable students to achieve high standard.

In closing, Mr. Chaiman, being poor does not mean that children cannot learn. It means that they must be given the opportunity to learn. Being poor does not mean that children cannot think and reason. It means that people who work in their behalf must be accountable for their progress. Being poor can mean being a member of a Chapter I school community of learning where everyone is focused on ensuring that all students will achieve.

Thank you for allowing me these comments.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Leeds.

Mr. LEEDS. Mr. Chairman, panel, and the committee, I wanted to thank you for this opportunity to testify and tell you, among other things, referring to the testimony we just heard, about a program that we have put in practice which just about incorporates every one of the recommendations that were made by the prior panel.

The Institute for Community Development is a privately funded organization that is nonprofit, that focuses sharply on improving the quality of education for youth at risk.

What we believe in is that all children should have the right to a quality education that is good enough so that they can make a living or they can become economically independent, that they can become socially strong, and that they can function successfully in our society.

We developed a program called STAR in one of the most underfunded minority communities in New York, in Roosevelt, Long Island, STAR now has over 100 youngsters in this program, about one-eighth of the school, and those whose parents have not moved away—not a single one has dropped out of the program.

It's a comprehensive, practical, collaborative, school based, no-frills support program that works just as hard on the children's development, personal development, as it does on the academics. Putting both together as sort of a holistic approach is what really makes the difference.

We believe, by the way, that this program, and I'll tell you in a moment about it, can be successfully replicated in other school districts around the Nation. We have already replicated it in another school district in the same area at a lower level, at a 7th and 8th grader level, where the STAR program works with 9th and 10th graders.

We started the program 3 years ago, by asking the staff of the junior high school to identify 50 ninth grade youngsters who they thought were the most likely to drop out and never graduate. Of these, 25 decided to join the program, and 25 did not. It was also pretty startling, the 25 kids who joined the program, and you remember that those were the ones among those who were the least likely to ever graduate, 3 years later every one of the children who joined the program has progressed to 12th grade and is expected to graduate from the school in June. Not a single one has dropped out, and most expect to go to college.

Of the 25 who did not join the program, only 2 made it to 12th grade, and the cost associated with the ones who did not get into school, is taking grades over in jail and all the other things, are enormous. We've added 30, approximately, new 9th grade youngsters every year over the last 4 years and there are now 120 kids in the program.

With the help of every dedicated staff, with some very innovative teaching, we are talking about development, staff development, these children are growing academically and emotionally. Our guiding principle, and you've heard this earlier in the testimony, is that all children can learn. And, by the way, I think most teachers can learn.

Knowing that, we set high expectations academically and socially, and the children live up to that. They focus on their future, because they all of a sudden feel that they have a future.

If a program like STAR was made available to most children at risk in our nation, you could possibly get 1 million kids off the street. At \$5,000 a youngster, that sounds like an investment of \$5 billion a year, as much as the program we are talking about. It sounds like a lot of money, but when we look at the savings, the billions and billions of dollars we can save when we have children that have enough education and skills to succeed, who don't deal in drugs, who don't go to jail, who don't get pregnant as teenagers, who don't drop out of school, who don't get involved in crimes or in gangs, youngsters who become adults that pay taxes, don't tax our system, clearly the savings will be many times greater than the cost.

I would like to keep within the time frame. I'd like to propose a beginning. Mr. Mica comes from a business background and so do I. Any business that would run without research and development to renew itself would not last long. I'd like to suggest that, perhaps, the program includes a 1 percent set-aside for innovative programs, and to take it down to the STAR program, if one took a fraction of that 1 percent and made it available you could cover maybe 2,000 to 4,000 youngsters in a dozen school districts. The programs would be fully evaluated, they would provide valuable data, and they would encourage the States and the school districts to incorporate the STAR philosophy into their structure.

The cost would be \$10 to \$20 million a year, a very small investment with a very high probability of success and overwhelming pay back.

I think of this as a methodology that we know that works, it's not a guess, that we know can be replicated, and I think of it as one small step in the budget, but a giant step in the future of our children.

Mr. TOWNS. Thank you very much, Mr. Leeds.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Leeds follows:]

Testimony before the Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee
Congress of the United States House of Representatives

By Gerard G. Leeds

Co-Chairperson, The Institute for Community Development, Manhasset, NY

Hearing "The Improving America's School Act of 1993: The Implications for Urban Districts"

All Children Can Learn

Good afternoon. My name is Gerard Leeds. I am co-chairperson of the Institute for Community Development. With me here is my colleague, Lavinia Dickerson, the Institute's Director of all our programs.

The Institute is a privately-funded, not-for-profit organization that seeks to improve the quality of education for our youth at-risk. It develops programs that are run in collaboration with existing school systems and helps to develop public policies that will allow all children to succeed in our society, especially those at-risk and from low-wealth and minority communities.

We appreciate your gracious invitation, Congressman Towns of New York, to discuss our highly successful STAR program for youth at risk.

STAR is a collaborative program in one of the most underfunded minority communities in New York, the Roosevelt School District. STAR has succeeded in keeping over 100 youngsters from dropping out of school, but has also helped them achieve academic and personal success, and a real chance at a decent future.

STAR is a comprehensive, practical, collaborative, school based, no-frills, support program that works. We believe it can be replicated successfully in other at-risk school districts throughout the country.

How it works becomes clear from the story of Joseph, who joined STAR 3 1/2 years ago. At the age of 13 he was selling drugs, cutting classes, hanging out on the street, and getting into a lot of problems. Today, he has grades in the 80's, is respected by his friends and by his teachers, and the STAR staff. He earned a \$1000 a month in his summer job, and paid taxes. When we asked him about his future, he said, "I want to graduate in June, I want to finish, and then I want to help other kids." That's the kind of change the right program can produce.

We started STAR three years ago, at the request of the Nassau Commission on Drugs and Alcohol and the Roosevelt Superintendent, by asking the staff at Roosevelt High School to identify 50 entering ninth-grade children whom they believed were "most likely to drop out and not graduate." Of these, 25 decided to join the program, and 25 did not.

Three years later, every one of the children who joined the program and still lives in the community has progressed to the 12th grade and is expected to graduate in June. Not a single one has dropped out and most expect to go on to college.

Of the 25 who chose not to join STAR, unfortunately, only two made it to the 12th grade. By adding 30 new ninth graders each year, we now have 120 children in the program, and none have dropped out. We have shown clearly that STAR gets results.

When ninth graders agree to join STAR, they sign a letter committing themselves, for four years, to 10 hours a week of supervised activities in addition to regular classes and school work.

Walking into the STAR room in Roosevelt is almost like entering a different world. The atmosphere is charged with excitement, learning and respect.

Here young people, whom the school once expected to fail, are hard at work. Academic coordinators address the individual needs of each participant. They provide tutoring, help with homework, language arts, critical thinking, study skills and computer literacy, PSAT & SAT preparations and constant encouragement.

Counseling and outreach staff provides individual and group services, workshops that develop self esteem and offer conflict resolution techniques, time management and critical choices, community service and incentive trips.

Career/college staff provide work/learning internships, job readiness training, college visits and preparation.

With the help of a dedicated staff, young people in STAR are learning to beat the odds against them. They are growing - academically and emotionally. They are getting ready for a productive life. The program becomes, in many cases, their family.

Our guiding principle, and it works, is that all children can learn. Knowing that, we set high expectations, academically and socially - and the kids live up to them. They focus on the future, because they finally have a future.

What we do now in Roosevelt, NY could be done anywhere in the U.S. There are hundreds of thousands of at-risk youngsters who deserve to get a decent, quality education for a productive life. We want to share a vision with you.

If a program like STAR was made available to most children at-risk in our nation, we could get almost a million kids off the street --- at \$5,000 per youngster --- for an investment of \$5 billion a year. That sounds like a lot of money, but let us clearly understand the savings.

How many billions can we save when we have children who have enough education and skills to succeed, who don't deal drugs, who don't go to jail, who don't get pregnant as teenagers, who don't drop out of school, who don't repeat grades and who don't get involved in crime, violence and gangs?

Youngsters who succeed will be adults paying taxes, not taxing our system. Clearly the savings will be many times greater than the cost.

Providing quality education and support for high school youngsters packs a double wallop. When we make sure that high school students succeed, we are assuring the success of tomorrow's parents. And when they succeed, the chances for their children's success improves enormously.

Through a program like STAR we can finally break the terrible cycle of disadvantage, of failure and decay, that has plagued our urban communities for decades.

To make a beginning, within the framework of Title I legislation we propose a carefully documented and evaluated pilot program, based on STAR covering 2,000 to 4,000 at risk youngsters in a dozen or more high-risk communities throughout the nation.

These programs would provide valuable data and encourage the states and their school districts to incorporate STAR methodology into their structure.

The cost, at \$5,000 per student, would be \$10 to \$20 million per year, a relatively small investment with a very high probability of success and an overwhelming payback in the future.

Members of the committee, the task of providing quality education and support for our at-risk children is most urgent.

We now know that there is a methodology, that works that it can be applied widely and that it is very cost effective.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us begin.

Let us take one small step in the budget and make it one giant step for our children.

Thank you.

Mr. TOWNS. Doctor Dickerson.

Ms. DICKERSON. I'm not going to talk for 5 minutes. I basically came to answer questions with Mr. Leeds, but in reading over many things about chapter 1, and I'm an educator and a psychologist, and welcome from Brooklyn. I am from Brooklyn.

Mr. TOWNS. Thank you.

Ms. DICKERSON. And, I live in Brooklyn, love Brooklyn.

STAR promotes students to become thinkers, to reason and to develop higher order skills.

Three years ago, there was a student in the STAR program that was reading at the third grade reading level. Today, that student is in 12th grade, and he is reading at a high school reading level, and he received over a 900 combined score on his SAT, looking at going to college.

The reason why this student was failing was that it was impossible, it was absolutely impossible for the needs, both the social, psychological, emotional needs of this young person to be met inside the classroom in a 30 or 40 minute period that the teacher spent working with them. In addition, that teacher was working with 35 other students.

So, this individual felt very neglected. And, even though he had the potential to learn, in fact, he had the potential to excel, it was not seen. He was placed in remediation classes, he was placed in special ed classes. The student didn't need to go into special ed classes, what the student needed was someone to listen to him, find out what the problems were at home, and figure out how do you address these problems, there are environmental problems during the course of the day where this young person spends more time than any other place other than his home.

The interesting thing was that when we developed STAR, we realized that young people were coming with what we as adults call baggage, and how you alleviate some of the baggage, how you teach them to cope, so that the emotional pressures that they are dealing with won't block or hinder their ability to be successful learners. So, therefore, the academic coordinators in the program were certified secondary education teachers, looked at what were his learning strengths and weaknesses. And, in their approach to developing a daily day-to-day program in which they worked in conjunction with the other teachers in the building, they found a way to help him improve academically through their structured academic enrichment sessions.

We did not call them remediation, because remediation creates a block psychologically in the minds of young people. No one wants to be felt like they are minor or inferior, so we called them enrichment.

And, during the enrichment, and coupling it with the counselor-social worker, the psychologist in the program, that helped him cope with his anger, that helped him cope with the peer group that was providing pressure outside the program, that helped him cope with the fact that his mother was on crack, this young man was able to come back into school every day and receive the support of the program and the endorsement of his teachers, so today he's in the top half of his graduating class.

This can only be done when you enter partnerships. It is impossible for us to think that we can educate young people today in a vacuum, vacuums don't work.

And, in terms of improving the quality of chapter 1, I think that if we improve quality of chapter 1, and we look at restructuring schools and placing a model in schools that educators can learn from, and they can share with other educators, and begin to replicate, people only change when there's an alternative to change, and they see how they can apply that change to their lives.

Mr. TOWNS. Let me thank all three of you for the new dimension, the community working with—I think that's very important.

Now, Doctor Leeds, Mr. Leeds, I don't know why I keep want to make you a doctor, I guess you are between the two doctors, so I just want to call you doctor as well.

Mr. LEEDS. I'm tempted to go back and get my Ph.D.

Mr. TOWNS. Let me just say, though, when I listen to you, and I think that some of us here talk about the fact that we are spending a lot of money and that we cannot continue to spend money, you know, when I listen to what you are saying I think that if we could follow this all the way through that we might be saving money, and let me just tell you, if I hear you correctly, that when you talk about the 25 students that were in your program, and the 25 that were not able to get into your program, I won't use the word rejected, not able to get in your program, and that only two of them sort of made out okay.

And then, at the same time, I look at the fact that we have a tremendous trade deficit with certain countries, and I recognize that it's impossible to be able to deal with the trade deficit if we have an educational deficit, it's impossible to be able to compete if our young people are dropping out of school, and to able to read, not able to write.

And then, at the same time, I just wonder what will happen, what happened to the other 23, that probably ended up in jail, and that here again that's very expensive. In our state, it costs approximately \$50,000 a year to maintain a person in an institution. I'm talking about just jails in New York State.

So, when I look at all of that, you know, I think that, you know, maybe we could save money if we would be just a little more innovative, just a little more creative, and a little more supportive of programs like your's.

I think that what you've said, in terms of—is very impressive, you know, in terms of the kind of performance that you've had, and the record in terms of achievement.

Let me just sort of raise a sort of question for the record. What does it take to be so successful? Do you think it could work on a large scale in a place like the New York City public schools? Now, I know you've been working in a couple of districts, but, if so, how would you go about implementing such a program in a massive place like New York, which has over 900,000 students in the system, how would we implement such a program in a place like that? Either one of you, Doctor Dickerson or Mr. Leeds.

Ms. DICKERSON. Having worked for the New York City public school system, it goes back to, essentially, how STAR creates an environment, and what happens in that environment, and being able

to break students down into small cluster groups, and having an instructor be able to look at the individual learning strengths or weaknesses of each student, and then be able to tailor the curriculum around the particular learning aspects of each student, and that can be done through the support of a really, keenly trained teacher who has gone through staff development, who works with teams of a counselor, who looks at what are the social problems that are blocking and hindering the learning, and also works with the parent.

When you put a teacher in a classroom that does not allow that teacher to have support from other outside entities, almost like not because he can put his hands on different outside factors and understand how those factors affect what's happening in the classroom, no learning will happen.

But, if you are able to say, this classroom is now going to become a laboratory. Inside this classroom over the next maybe three or four years I'm going to work with this group of students to ensure that they have mastery in a particular area or subject that I'm teaching. It can happen in every school across America.

Mr. LEEDS. I'd like to add something to that. How do you fight a war? You fight it one hill at a time, one company at a time. You train people, and you develop, to begin with, a common focus and a common goal. If you have a common focus and a common goal, you begin to move in the same direction.

I think the President tried to do that in health care, I'm hoping they'll do it next in education, but I think the key to it will be training.

New York City had a very successful program at one time, and I think it went away, called Giant Step, and when they started Giant Step they did—before anyone was allowed in the classroom in this Giant Step program, they trained them with 3 or 4 months.

If we trained teachers for 3 or 4 months, we could do miraculous things, and I think it's one of the things to do, is to develop the very things that were said earlier, to train people and then leave them alone and hold them accountable for what they are doing, and say you can have this job for as long as you are successful. I think it can be done, it can be done on a large scale. This country has done great things with things like the G.I. bill or rights, it's done it with the Atomic Energy Commission, I think you can do it at a large scale, but I think you are going to have to build models before you do that, and I think that's essential.

So, what I'm really saying is, let us build a series of models and let people get confidence in it, and then fly.

Mr. TOWNS. You know, some people have problems with this whole staff development, in terms of being—crying to put money into developing staff. They feel that if a person is trained to do a job, then that they should be able to do the job, and that why is all this staff development necessary.

Maybe you could help me, Doctor Simmons, in terms of why—what would be staff development? What would you do if you were walking into an area and you wanted to develop your staff, what are some of the things that would happen to be able to deal with a target population?

Ms. SIMMONS. All right. First of all, Mr. Leeds mentioned Giant Step, and the Giant Step model is still alive. It's been renamed Super Start, and they do have continuously, monthly staff development.

One of the things you would do is to look at the needs of the staff, and help the staff determine what their needs are, and where they need assistance.

Then, you would look at the needs of the total school, and where the staff and different programs can work collaboratively.

You also have to look at the needs of the students and their families, because we have many children who would not have a meal every day, if it were not for the school feeding programs. We have lots of parents that need assistance in finding housing, and learning to navigate the system. So, you have to look at the staff and look at the total environment from which the child comes from.

Mr. TOWNS. Right. I think that that's a very interesting point, because more than sometimes in terms of the teacher being able to do a lot of things, I think it's being able to understand in terms of the problems in the background, and what the child is actually going through, and I guess that sort of makes the point, Doctor Dickerson, in terms of having the ability to reach out and to involve, in terms of other agencies, you know, in the process.

And, I don't know in terms of, you know, exactly how we can do all this, but I know some schools, you know, just sort of believe that the education of the child is their responsibility and that's it, and no outside forces should come in.

In fact, I think that some schools should be changed, the name from public school, because they don't want anybody to go in unless it's the children or the teachers, they don't even want parents in there too much. So, I think that we have to sort of create that atmosphere and climate to let people know that they would encourage, in terms of involvement with the school itself, so I think the target concept that was talked about here today, and this one percent innovation, I'm not sure I understand what that means, but I'd like to hear more about that, Mr. Leeds, one percent innovation.

Mr. LEEDS. OK. Well, what I'm saying is this, that, first of all, the world has changed, the world has become a high-technology world, education needs are different.

You can't find a job with a third grade education, yet, when we have ninth graders coming into the STAR program, the majority were reading, I think, the average was fifth grade reading level, you can't make it with that. You drop further and further behind, because when you go to school and read at a fifth grade reading level, and you are getting material for ninth grade, you are going to fall further and further behind.

So, I think the first that has to happen, I think, is that we have to make schools accountable, and I mean accountable by saying, no, you can't keep this job—you bright this up earlier, if your kids—you can't be a principal in this school if your kids are going to read at a fifth grade reading level and they are supposed to be ninth graders.

I think to let our country be—I think the latest statistics, what is it 50 percent of American adults are functionally illiterate, that's

no way to educate our children. I think we need to look at systemic change at that point, but I think we have to do it a step at a time.

And, when I talk about innovation I'm saying this, again, let me reach back to business, it's common practice to say, I'll take a very successful company that you all know called Hewlett-Packard, 9 percent of their gross revenues goes into research and development. I'm saying, let us take 1 percent or 2 percent of the money that is in the act and say, give that to innovative programs, where you set goals, and I've seen these happen, you can do it on a proposal basis, and where these programs become models for the country. I think it needs to be done, because otherwise the system we have, and I'll quote President Clinton when he talked about health care, he said, "That system is broken, it needs fixing." Our educational system is broken, I think our educational system needs fixing. And, you won't do it by leaving everything the same and just throwing more money at it.

Mr. TOWNS. Let me thank you, and I agree with the fact that I think that if we looked at our educational system as a business, that we probably would change things, and probably do some things differently, because I don't know of any business that's losing 50 percent of its product that would continue in business.

So, when we look at what's happening with some of our schools, where 50 percent of the students drop out, I think that we should not continue to do business as usual.

I yield now to my colleague, Congressman Mica, and may I add, Congressman, we have another vote on.

Mr. MICA. Yes, I see that, as soon—I won't talk or question beyond the next buzzer here, we'll be going.

Doctor Simmons, you come from an urban school district.

Ms. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. MICA. What's the starting salary of your teachers and your principals?

Ms. SIMMONS. I think it's based on contractual agreements with the New York City Board of Ed, so I think it's somewhere around \$25,000, and probably principals salary of approximately \$65,000.

Mr. MICA. Do your teachers have tenure or some type of job security?

Ms. SIMMONS. Well, based on their contract, you have to work for 5 years before you can get tenure, plus you have to have a master's degree. That's for teachers and principals.

Mr. MICA. Do you have any type of teacher testing, or teacher qualification programs?

Ms. SIMMONS. That's done by the Central Board of Education. The standards are set by the State education department, and the Central Board of Education of the New York City public schools does the testing and examining for teachers and administrators.

Mr. MICA. Now, I again, get back to the question of accountability. If we are not producing, if the principals don't have their schools under control, or the teacher is not performing, then we need to make changes.

I know that some of the district that you represent, or most of the district you represent, is in a poverty or economically disadvantaged level, and I notice that only seven of the schools have a pre-school program?

Ms. SIMMONS. That's correct.

Mr. MICA. Is the primary reason there funding?

Ms. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. MICA. It is.

Are there programs—now some of what you proposed in your testimony sounds good, about bringing the parents and children together, but is that really possible in these situations? I find that even in a middle-class setting, it's very difficult to get the parents involved with problem students, and usually the parents are part of the problem, or the home setting is part of the problem. Is that also the situation, where is what you are proposing just fluff?

Ms. SIMMONS. We have large numbers of parents participating in the schools. We have a very active parent council. Parents come to school board meetings.

When we were able to have an adult basic ed program through the Giant Step program that Mr. Leeds mentioned, we had more parents than the funding was able to support, so I think all parents, regardless of their socioeconomic background, do feel, and realize, and want their children to succeed in schools.

Mr. MICA. Well, I'm wondering, too, you know, having been around education for 20 years, I see programs that are successful, like yours, Mr. Leeds, and I know that there are success stories in the preschool programs, and some of the title I programs have been very successful where implemented, I'm just wondering if we have to do a lot more reinventing the wheel, so to speak. There are obviously a lot of good programs to model after. What is your recommendation in that area? Do you think we should be looking for, you know, new teaching skills and programs? You indicated you thought we ought to put at least one percent into this innovation, what do you think we should do as far as that innovation, as opposed to just concentrating on what we know works?

Ms. SIMMONS. Well, I think we need to do a combination of both. We can concentrate on what we know works, and look at the elements that make it work, and do it in other areas, but we should also look at the whole system, systemic change, and have everyone focus on student achievement, where the top priority is setting high standards for students, so that they will achieve.

Ms. MICA. What about the family structure in your district, is there is a predominant single parent situation?

Ms. SIMMONS. Yes, and we find that in those situations, I think the parents are even more willing to work, because they realize that they cannot do this by themselves.

For some of them, the school is the only structure that the children have.

Ms. MICA. Last question is, what if we had a real pull-out program, where these kids are given one or two shots and they continue to be discipline problems, or that—this isn't to your level, it's probably at your level, 13, you have lost them, I think what you are doing is very important, and it's a sin that we've only got seven schools that are covered with these preschool programs, because then you get to this stage and it's much more expensive, but what if we had a real pull-out program, where you took these kids, literally, conscripted them out of their setting at age 13 or 14, would

you recommend something like that, into, say, a force program, such as you have?

Mr. LEEDS. I have to go back a step. There's nothing forced about this program.

Ms. MICA. No, but if they were required to participate in a program.

Ms. DICKERSON. If they were required to participate in a program, the same thing would probably happen that happened in New York City, drop-out prevention programs, aid for attendance improvement, which meant that there was really no change in terms of their attitude or perceptions about themselves as learners, so, therefore, they did not apply themselves in the classroom.

What you need to have is a working partnership with that classroom teacher, and supports to what's going on in that classroom.

STAR does not—STAR is not the primary educator. What it says to that classroom teacher is that, if you are doing your job, and you dig out the foundation, what we will do is support that foundation, enrich it, embellish it, lest it will come back to you tomorrow more ready to learn.

Ms. MICA. But, STAR is voluntary, I'm talking about those that don't want to participate, but are still disruptive, that are not part of this.

Mr. LEEDS. Mr. Mica, our experience is that once you have this model in the school, the others begin to converge toward it, No. 1.

Ms. MICA. They do?

Mr. LEEDS. No. 2, I think it has to be understood that almost half the staff on the STAR program is counseling. In other words, there's not just teachers, academic teachers. Academics without counseling for high-risk kids is not enough. Counseling without academics is not enough, because if they don't succeed in school, then the counseling doesn't do any good. If they learn to succeed in school, they learn to succeed in life, and, incidentally, in many, many cases, in one school 40 percent of the kids are in foster care, in many cases the program becomes their family. The peer group takes the place of the gang, and their whole life changes. They begin to look at the future, and their whole life changes. That's why it's so effective, it's a low price at \$5,000 a kid.

Ms. MICA. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. TOWNS. All right. Let me thank you, Congressman Mica, but I also thank the witnesses for your very practical approach to the problem.

And, I assume that you also use the young people that are in the program also as role models for the younger ones, and this sort of makes a whole lot of sense, and I say to you that I think that when we invest in youngsters that way, I think that it will make a difference in terms of what happens, in terms of later years of life.

I just wish we had some way that we could follow this and some way that we could sort of show, demonstrate that if we don't invest this way that we spend a lot of money, we do not save money, that we end up paying it another way. Instead of spending it on the front burner, we end up spending it on the back burner, so I think that if in some way or another we could demonstrate that, then

maybe that we would be able to get the kind of broad-based support for programs like you've described, that we actually need.

So, here again, I want to thank all the witnesses for their testimony today, and the record will remain open until tomorrow, October 20, to the close of business. This hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:45 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05982 445 6

ISBN 0-16-057165-0

